DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 415 RC 019 973

AUTHOR Barnhardt, Carol
TITLE Life on the Other Side: Alaska Native Teacher Education Students and the University of Alaska Fairbanks.
PUB DATE Oct 94
NOTE 308p.; Thesis, University of British Columbia.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Persistence; *Alaska Natives; American Indian Education; *College Graduates; College Preparation; College Students; *Cultural Pluralism; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; Higher Education; School Holding Power; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Experience; Success; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Student Support Services; *University of Alaska Fairbanks

ABSTRACT

The thesis identifies factors that have contributed to the academic success of Alaska Native teacher education students who graduated from the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) between 1989 and 1993. It contains a brief history of schooling for Alaska Native peoples; a description of the programs, student services, and academic coursework at UAF designed to respond to the interests and needs of Alaska Native students; and a review and analysis of the experiences of 50 Alaska Native teacher education graduates based on data obtained through interviews, review of student records, and participant observation. Five factors were identified as contributing to students' academic success: (1) a teaching and learning environment responsive to the interests and needs of culturally diverse students; (2) student support services respectful of the interests and needs of culturally diverse students; (3) strong family and community support; (4) supportive prior school and life experiences; and (5) exceptional individual efforts. The data indicate that accommodation and adaptations by both the students and the institution were essential to student success. Appendices describe 27 programs and services that address Alaska Native peoples and issues at UAF, and list Alaska Native and rural undergraduate courses at UAF, student database variables, and interview themes. Contains 259 references. (Author/KS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 415

LIFE ON THE OTHER SIDE: ALASKA NATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

by

CAROL BARNHARDT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carol Barnhardt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
Department of Educational Studies

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
October 1994

© Carol Barnhardt

RC 019973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIFE ON THE OTHER SIDE:
ALASKA NATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

by
Carol Barnhardt

ABSTRACT

This study examines the conditions that contribute to the success of indigenous minority students in higher education by focusing on the experiences of 50 Alaska Native teacher education students who graduated from the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) between 1989 and 1993. Although the number of Alaska Native students enrolled at UAF has increased in the past 10 years, the percentage of graduates continues to be significantly lower than their percentage of the student and state population.

The study addresses the question: *what factors have contributed to the academic success of Alaska Native teacher education graduates at UAF?* It includes three components: a brief history of schooling for Alaska Native people; a description of the programs, student services and academic coursework at UAF designed to respond to the interests and needs of Alaska Native students; and a review and analysis of the experiences of 50 Alaska Native teacher education students based on data obtained through interviews, reviews of student records and participant observation.

The study identifies multiple factors that have contributed to the academic success of Alaska Native students, including the following: a teaching and learning environment responsive to the interests and needs of culturally diverse students; student support services respectful of the interests and needs of culturally diverse students; strong family and community support; supportive prior school and life experiences; and exceptional individual efforts. Accommodations and adaptations by both the students *and* the institution were essential. Recommendations are made for institutions, faculty, students and communities who are interested in developing campus environments where Alaska Native, and other cultural minority students, can be fully represented, respected, involved and successful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii

Table of Contents iii

List of Tables vi

Acknowledgment vii

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 1
- The University of Alaska Fairbanks as a Microcosm 3
- Overview of the Research Process 7
- Research Components 10
  - Historical Account of Schooling for Alaska Native People 10
  - Alaska Native Programs, Student Services and Academic Coursework on the Fairbanks Campus of the University of Alaska 11
  - University Experiences of 50 Alaska Native Teacher Education Graduates 11

CHAPTER 2. MINORITY STUDENTS AND HIGHER EDUCATION 14
- Comparative Education: A Commonality of Challenges 15
- Minority Students in Higher Education in the United States 20
  - Changing Demographics 22
  - Expanded Research Approaches 24
- Native Americans in Higher Education 31
- Comments 34

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN 37
- Qualitative Educational Research: Multiple Approaches 41
  - Critical Ethnography 44
  - Cultural Anthropology Ethnography 46
  - Other Qualitative Approaches 52
- Methodology 53
  - Site and Sample 53
  - Researcher as Participant and Observer 54
  - Time Line 55
  - Data Collection Techniques 56
- Guiding Considerations 63
  - The Role of Theory 63
  - Sociolinguistics in Educational Research 65
  - Focus of Research and Interpretation 66
  - First Principle—Do No Harm 68

CHAPTER 4. HISTORY OF SCHOOLING FOR ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE 73
The Alaska Context 75
Federal Indian Policy and Schooling in Alaska 78
Treaties 79
Reservations and Allotments 80
Civilization Fund Act 82
The Dual System of Schools in Alaska 82
Federal Educational Reform Efforts 89
Federal Programs for All Students 90
Federal Programs for Native Americans 91
Alaska Educational Reform Efforts Since 1970 94
Alaska Schools Today 97
Comments 98

CHAPTER 5. ALASKA NATIVE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AT UAF: CHALLENGES AND CHANGES 101
The University of Alaska Fairbanks and the Research University Context 104
The Challenge of Multiculturalism in Higher Education 109
The Challenge at UAF 111
The Changes at UAF: Alaska Native Programs, Student Services and Coursework 114
Alaska Native Departments, Programs and Academic Coursework 116
General Multicultural Course Requirements 120
Alaska Native Faculty 122
Alaska Native Research Institutes and Faculty Development 124
Alaska Native Advising and Academic Support Programs 125
Alaska Native Advisory Councils 130
Comments 131
Catalysts for Change at UAF 131
Responses to Pressures from Outside the University 132
Accommodations to Pressures from Within the University 137
Comments 140

CHAPTER 6. FROM HIGH SCHOOL TO COLLEGE: SURVIVING THE TRANSITION 142
Getting Ready for College 145
High School Demographics 147
Reflections on High School Experiences 150
Why College? 154
Routes to UAF 156
Transferring to UAF 157
UAF as a First Choice 158
Previous Work Experiences 161
The First Year: Out-of-Classroom Concerns 162
Housing for Students Who Were Parents 163
Housing for Single Students 166
University Significant Others 168
Other Non-Academic Considerations 170
The First Year: Academic Concerns 174
Math Classes and Test Scores 177
English and Speech Classes and Test Scores 179
Science Classes and Test Scores 182
Grade Point Averages 184
Comments 185

CHAPTER 7. BEING A NATIVE STUDENT AND BECOMING A TEACHER 187
  Being a Native Student at UAF 187
  The Middle Years 192
    Finding Good Courses 192
    Alaska Native and Rural Courses 196
    Declaring a Major 197
    Why Teach? 198
    Campus Jobs 201
    Taking a Break 204
    Maintaining Family Contact 207
  The Professional Year 210
    The UAF Teacher Education Program 210
    Urban Schools 212
    Differences in Interaction Styles 215
    Student Teaching in Rural Schools 218
    Student Teaching in Urban Schools 220
    Students' Recommendations 221
  Employment and Future Plans 223
  Keys to Success 225
  Comments 228

CHAPTER 8: LEARNING ABOUT LIFE ON THE OTHER SIDE: RECOMMENDATIONS 230
  Factors That Helped Students to be Academically Successful 231
  Institutional Recommendations 234
  Faculty Recommendations 245
  Student Recommendations 249
  Community Recommendations 252
  Implications for Further Research 253
  Comments 255

Bibliography 257

Appendix A Alaska Native Programs and Student Services On Campus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks 273

Appendix B Alaska Native and Rural Undergraduate Courses at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1993-94 296

Appendix C Student Data Base Field Names 298

Appendix D Student Interview Themes 300

LIST OF TABLES

1. UAF Departments, Programs and Special Academic Activities With an Alaska Native Focus ____ 117

2. UAF Academic Course Offerings With an Alaska Native and/or Rural Focus ____ 119

3. UAF Alaska Native and Other Native American Full-Time Faculty Distribution by Academic Unit, 1992 ____ 123

4. UAF Alaska Native Advising and Student Support Programs on Campus at UAF ____ 125

5. Students' High School Contexts and Years of Graduation ____ 149

6. Students' High School Organizations and Sizes by Enrollment ____ 150

7. Students' ACT Math Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Math Courses ____ 177

8. Students' ACT English Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Communication Skills Courses ____ 180

9. Students' ACT Natural Science Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Science Courses ____ 183

10. Students' Grade Point Averages at UAF ____ 184

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Without exception, every student I interviewed for this study said that support from their family, friends, and people at the university was essential to their success. The experiences related to me by students took on new meaning throughout this study as I too realized how important it was to have family, friends, colleagues and committee members who were genuinely interested in this study, and who cared enough about it to provide thoughtful and honest critiques and conversations. I am grateful to many people for what I have learned in the past few years.

I have learned from my committee. Jean Barman, Vincent D'Oyley and Allison Tom individually shared with me "everything they knew." In addition, their work as a committee served as a powerful example of how university faculty members with quite diverse professional and personal expertise and experiences could work together in ways that genuinely fostered collaboration. The work was evidence of their interest in, and respect for, views that were different from their own.

I have learned from my fellow UBC graduate students in Social and Educational Policy. We are scattered across the globe but, thanks to E-Mail, I have continued to benefit from the expertise of a very diverse group of doctoral students. Reva Joshee in particular has taught me much.

I have learned from several members of the UAF community: student service personnel, faculty, support staff, and alumni. They shared ideas, information and their time. The people in Rural Student Services and Alaska Native Studies patiently answered questions or helped me to find answers. Pat Dubbs, in the Department of Rural Development, served as an unofficial sounding board and responded to three full years of requests for advice and information—and then he promptly retired!

I have learned from all the students I have worked with at UAF, but many of my most powerful lessons have come from those who participated in this study because I had the opportunity to get to know them better. These students are now my colleagues, and already they are making important and innovative contributions to families, schools and communities throughout Alaska where they are living and working. Their willingness to share their university experiences for this study will benefit those that follow in their footsteps, and contribute to our understanding of how to best develop campuses that meet the interests and needs of students who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.

I have learned new lessons about "family" throughout my study. I was very fortunate to have so much support—and a great deal of frank feedback—from our three young adult children. They tolerated my constant requests for conversations about their own college and work experiences in settings that ranged from Africa to East Harlem to rural Alaska. John's computer knowledge, Amy's understanding of how schools work, and Anna's ability to see the big picture contributed directly to the process and product of this dissertation. Ray, my husband, has served in multiple roles throughout this study. I am grateful for all of the reading, responding and reacting he provided, but far more importantly, I am appreciative of, and respectful for, the example he has set. His patience, persistence, optimism, efforts and accomplishments at utilizing a university environment as a place and context for bringing together people from very diverse cultural backgrounds to learn from one another has served as a powerful role model for what I hope to accomplish personally and professionally.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> I have heard it said by some parents speaking about the return of their children from school that they had changed. One young lady told me that to cope in her new environment while attending college, she had to become "mean." She told me that after growing up being taught in the Yup'ik custom to be humble, kind and friendly, she discovered that *life on the other side* was not the same. She said she had to become another person, an opposite of herself. In this way she survives college. (Active, 1992)

During the time I was interviewing Alaska Native students for this study, the above comments by John Active, a Yup'ik Eskimo commentator for a radio and TV station in the rural community of Bethel, appeared in the Fairbanks newspaper. As I read the article I realized that he was describing some of the same issues that were central to my research project. His examples of the contradictions between traditional Yup'ik ways of teaching and learning and formal Western ways, and the images provoked by his articles resonated with the stories being told to me by Native students at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF).

The issues raised by Active are similar to those expressed by many Alaska Native students, parents and community members that I have worked with during the 24 years I have been involved with education in Alaska. I have frequently heard students talk or write about the notion of duality, or life in two worlds, and papers with titles like "Not In Two Worlds But One" (Jones-Sparck, 1992), "Does One Way of Life Have to Die So Another Can Live?" (Yupiktak Bista, 1977), and "Conflicting Visions in Alaska Native Education" (Dauenhauer, 1982) have surfaced with remarkable regularity since Western education was introduced in Alaska 100 years ago.

The dilemmas inherent in living in two worlds are frequently discussed not only by Alaska Native people, but by others who are also vigorously involved in debates about the implications of this duality for higher education institutions. Three weeks after John Active's article was published in the Fairbanks newspaper, an article entitled "Professors Caution UAF on Student Diversity Goal" described the response of several faculty members to some of the goals proposed by the UAF Strategic Leadership Planning Board—a university-wide group charged with charting the future of the institution (Troyer, 1992). The goal they were responding to stated that UAF should strive to "become a model demonstrating how gender, racial and cultural diversity strengthen a university and society" and should strive to "make UAF the first choice for Alaska Natives." However, a prominent faculty member challenged the wisdom of the recommendation by stating that "a strict student diversity goal could hurt the university," and he supported his view by stating that "the undergraduate program of the University of California at Berkeley is in 'shambles' because it has tried too hard to have proportional representation in the student body." Another professor said that "giving breaks to minority students will diminish their accomplishments," and he indicated that the Board was "developing a problem where there's not a problem" (Troyer, 1992).

The *diversity debate* within the UAF community is a reflection of what has been occurring with increasing frequency and stridency in both national and international arenas. People on both sides of the debate are advocating the kind of campus community that will reflect their belief system. However, when the values and priorities are polarized at opposite ends of a continuum, as frequently happens on culturally heterogeneous campuses like UAF, it is difficult to find common ground between the "ivory tower" tradition and the demands for equal opportunity and recognition.

The overall intent of this study is to better understand what John Active means by *"life on the other side*." To address this question, I first review aspects of the history of schooling for Alaska Native people and examine the development of Alaska Native programs and student services for University of Alaska Fairbanks students. The core of the project is an account of the experiences of 50 Alaska Native teacher education graduates. I seek to determine what it was in their experiences that contributed to their academic success. In so doing, I look beyond the long standing conventional question of How College Affects Students, (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991), and also ask "How Do Students Affect Colleges?"

In addressing questions such as these in higher education, previous researchers have often made an observation similar to that by Irving Spitzberg and Virginia Thorndike (1992) who, following their extensive analysis of current issues in higher education studies, said "Everywhere we looked we found both paradox and promise" (p. xv). A comment by Eber Hampton, president of Saskatchewan Indian Federated College at the University of Regina, captured the essence of this paradox when he described education for Native people as "both the problem and the solution" (1993). Through this research I have attempted to identify some of the problems that exist in, and some of the promising practices that are available to, institutions and minority students who wish to contribute to the development of campus communities where all students have the opportunity to participate and be successful—campuses where minority students do not have to become an opposite of themselves in order to succeed.

The University of Alaska Fairbanks as a Microcosm

The title of the book The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education (Altbach & Lomotey, 1991) does not understate the current status of "the minority issue" on many American campuses, as viewed from the perspective of academics and non-academics alike. The attempts by institutions to respond to the presence of culturally diverse student populations has stimulated heated debates about minority issues, and many of these discussions are taking place in very public and politicized arenas. Assumptions about the fundamental goals and structures of Western higher education institutions are increasingly being questioned almost everywhere. Few institutions have been successful in determining when, how, or whether to reorganize for diversity. In the book Campus Life: In Search of Community, Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation states that:

> Diversity has . . . dramatically changed the culture of American higher education. . . . For the first 200 years, college students appeared socially and economically to be very much alike. . . . Today, men and women students come from almost every racial and ethnic group in the country and from every other nation in the world. While colleges and universities celebrate this pluralism, the harsh truth is that, thus far, many campuses have not been particularly successful in building larger loyalties within a diverse student body, and there is disturbing evidence that deeply ingrained prejudices persist. Faculty,

> administrators, and students are now asking whether community can be achieved. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990, p. 4)

The University of Alaska Fairbanks provides a useful setting in which to examine higher education's response to a changing student population because in many ways it is a microcosm of public higher education institutions. Although the University of Alaska began as a single-campus land-grant College of Agriculture and Mining in Fairbanks in 1917, it has since evolved into a complex statewide university system. There are urban campuses in Fairbanks (UAF), Anchorage (UAA) and Juneau (University of Alaska Southeast, UAS) and multiple rural campuses and centers located throughout the state. Each of the three urban campuses has its own chancellor, and the offices of the University of Alaska Statewide president and administration are located in Fairbanks.

UAF is identified as "the flagship campus" within the University of Alaska system because it is the only doctoral granting institution in the state (with approximately 10 Ph.D.s each year), the site of an internationally recognized Geophysical Institute established by the United States Congress in 1946, and the focal point for Alaska's land- sea- and space-grant efforts. In 1987 UAF was also designated as the unit responsible for nearly all of the statewide system's rural programs and campuses. With its mandate to serve and provide educational programs and services for most of the rural areas of the state, as well as for campus-based students in Fairbanks, UAF has evolved into an institution that provides a wide variety of programs. It offers 9 technical and vocational certificates, 13 associate degrees, undergraduate degrees in more than 70 fields of study (with 75 majors), master's degrees in over 50 fields, and 7 doctoral programs—primarily in science fields.

Like universities elsewhere in the United States, the UAF student population has become far more heterogeneous than at any time previously, with a student body that is diverse with respect to age, gender, class, ethnicity, culture, and race. According to the UAF 1992-93 Undergraduate Catalog and the UAF 1992 Fact Book, the following demographics described UAF in the fall of 1991.

- Total enrollment was 8,891 students (including rural and urban campuses)

- There were 5 branch campuses, 4 of which were in rural areas
- Enrollment on the Fairbanks campus was 5,712
- Approximately 3,600 (40%) were full-time students
- 58 percent were female, 42 percent were male
- Average age was 30
- 89 percent were Alaska residents, 8 percent were from other states, 3 percent were from foreign countries
- 92 percent were undergraduate students, 8 percent were graduate students

Alaska Native students are the largest ethnic and cultural minority group at UAF. In 1993, approximately 450 were students on the Fairbanks campus (about 9 percent), and an additional 850 were enrolled through the rural campuses. Over ninety percent of Alaska Native students on the Fairbanks campus were enrolled as full-time students. The next largest ethnic groups at UAF were Asians (2 percent), Blacks (2 percent), and Hispanics (2 percent), nearly all of whom were on the Fairbanks campus. There were 262 international students from 45 countries, and they represented 21 percent of the graduate student population. The countries with the largest representations were China (30 percent of the international student population), Canada (20 percent), and India (14 percent). Twelve percent of UAF students came from outside of Alaska, and on the Fairbanks campus, students from California, Washington, Oregon and New York made up about one third of all out-of-state students. Many out-of-state students were spouses, or children, of military personnel stationed at army or air-force bases in the Fairbanks area.

Although accurate statistics are extremely difficult to obtain and verify, the data available suggest that the actual number, and the percentage, of Native students relative to the total enrollment at UAF make it one of the highest concentration of Native American students at any public four-year institution in the United States. Like Native American students in higher education institutions elsewhere in the United States, more Alaska Native students are participating in, and graduating from, UAF programs than at any time in the past (Fries, 1987; Mingle, 1987; U.S. Department of Education, 1990a; 1990b; University of Alaska Fairbanks

Fact Book, 1993; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education & The College Board, 1991). Yet disproportionately high numbers of Native students (in comparison to the overall population) continue to leave the university system each year before completing their programs, and the percent of Alaska Native graduates (5 percent average over the past 15 years) is about half of their proportion of the overall enrollment. At the same time, several political and institutional interest groups in Alaska, including the University of Alaska Board of Regents, the 12 Alaska Native regional corporations, and the National Education Association/Alaska, have publicly stated their strong support for policies, programs and practices that will lead to increased opportunities and greater success in higher education for more Alaska Native people.

There is an especially urgent concern about the small number of Native people with teaching degrees. Approximately 4.0 percent of the teachers in Alaska are Native, while Native people comprise 15.6 percent of the total state population. The pressure for a greater number of Native teachers is especially strong in rural areas where the Native population is concentrated, and where there has been a history of high teacher turnover rates and perennial shortages. Teachers who are currently recruited from urban Alaska or from the Lower 48 states do not usually stay long in Alaska Native villages because of the geographic and cultural isolation (Dickerson, 1980). Numerous reports have indicated that the best way to address the major problems caused by the shortages and high turnover rates is to increase the number of people in rural teaching positions who are knowledgeable about rural Alaska, and who have first-hand familiarity with, and long-term commitments to village people and the rural environment. Historically, Alaska Native students have enrolled in the teacher education program in greater numbers than in any other program on the UAF campus. Recently, however, the percentage and actual number of Native students choosing teacher education is decreasing—a nationwide trend for all minority students (Blankenship et al, 1992; Education Commission of the States, 1990; Futrell, 1989; James, 1993).

Like elsewhere, information currently available about the experiences of Alaska Native students at UAF is primarily quantitative, and these data serve as the basis for making most decisions about programs and policies. There is little written documentation or research that has attempted to provide *explanations* for these statistics. This study has been designed to provide such information. It is intended to increase our understanding of what the statistics mean for the UAF community, as well as for other institutions that are developing programs and policies for changing student populations—especially other public institutions where a significant number of minority students are enrolled. Concerned groups within institutions include students, faculty, student services personnel, administrators, and policy making bodies at different levels (e.g. departments, colleges, central administration, student government groups, faculty senate, Board of Regents). Interested groups external to the institution include state agencies involved in education, governing and policy-making bodies, Native for-profit and non-profit organizations, employers, school districts, parents and school boards.

Overview of the Research Process

The specific intent of this study is to systematically determine *what factors contributed to the academic success of 50 Alaska Native teacher education students at the University of Alaska Fairbanks*. It is a research question that has grown out of many years of work with Native and non-Native students in a variety of Alaskan educational settings in my roles as a university instructor and researcher, and as a result of my associations with First Nations people in Canada and Maori people in New Zealand.

The impetus for this specific question emerged from my experiences with students on the Fairbanks campus of UAF, following several years of work with students who were in off-campus, rural settings. On the Fairbanks campus one of the most frequently discussed topics in faculty meetings and seminars has been how to improve the recruitment and retention rates of Alaska Native students. Many of the policies and practices developed to respond to this concern have been based on research findings about the variables that lead to success in higher education for *traditional* college students in the United States. Those most frequently referred to include high school preparation, standardized test scores, financial security, and qualified faculty.

During the first few semesters I taught on the Fairbanks campus I had the opportunity to work with several Alaska Native students who theoretically were "low risks," because they met the criteria considered important for predicting success in college. These students came to UAF from demanding high schools with high GPAs and good test scores. They had more-than-adequate financial aid packages, and they had the opportunity to work with academically-qualified instructors. And yet, in spite of fitting the profile of a-student-likely-to-succeed, many of these students did not successfully complete their first year at UAF, and several others chose to leave the university even after successfully completing three or four years. It became evident to me that the typical reasons for "dropping out," and the university's subsequent reliance on traditional solutions, did not provide an adequate explanation or solution for the disproportionately low retention and graduation rates of Alaska Native students at UAF.

Because of my previous experiences with students in rural areas, I was aware that several conditions for Alaska Natives were quite different on the Fairbanks campus than in rural areas. In Fairbanks, Native students were a minority; most lived on campus and were full-time students; and few had extended family, community, linguistic or cultural support systems available in the Fairbanks region. It seemed evident that these were important variables for a program, department or institution to consider if it desired to make changes that would respond to, and respect, a non-traditional student population that included a large number of cultural minority students.

My research challenge therefore was to make a contribution to the "recruitment and retention" debate by designing a study that would help identify factors that contributed to the academic success of Alaska Native students—i.e. make an effort to learn more about "life on the other side." In order to accomplish this, I knew that the study would have to be comprehensive enough to allow me to look for and identify factors that may not have been considered in previous studies, and it would have to take into account the influence of those conditions that are specific to Alaska, and to Alaska Native people, because of the state's unique economic, geographic, and educational environment.

I chose to focus my attention on the experiences of students who had already demonstrated they could "survive" in college because this allowed me to draw upon the insights and experiences of successful Alaska Native students. I would thus have the opportunity to learn more about "what really worked" as opposed to the more traditional approach in which the focus is on students who drop-out. In addition, because I had worked with many Native students who had left the university, I was well aware of the difficulties I would face if I attempted to locate a representative group of students who had left UAF before graduation, and the time and money necessary to interview these students would have required a considerable amount of outside funding.

As well as drawing upon what I have learned from my teaching and research experiences in both on- and off-campus environments at UAF, I have relied upon an eclectic body of academic literature to help develop and organize my study. The literature I found most useful, as described in Chapter 2, came from people whose professional work crossed academic disciplines and addressed issues in a holistic and contextually sensitive manner. Specific fields of study I draw from include: (1) higher education and minority students, (2) comparative education, (3) the history of Native American education, and (4) anthropology and education. These four areas were most instrumental in contributing to the development of the conceptual base for my research and to the organization of a methodological framework relevant to my research question.

In Chapter 3 I identify the following considerations as central to framing and conducting my research, as well as thinking through issues related to interpretation and analysis.

- No single discipline provides an appropriate theoretical and methodological framework for addressing my research question. Therefore, an *interdisciplinary* approach has been used to develop and implement my research design.

- *Culture* has been a central construct in the research question I posed, and an *ethnographic* research approach, from a *cultural anthropology tradition*, has provided both a way of thinking and a methodology that best facilitates the kind of cultural analysis necessary for this study.
- *Native Americans*, and *Alaska Natives* specifically, need to be recognized *as distinctive from other minority groups* in the United States. For my purposes it is not appropriate to conduct a study in which Alaska Natives are represented as members of a single classification of people referred to as "minorities." It has been important to identify some of the beliefs and values that Native Americans share; recognize and be sensitive to fundamental differences among the 400 tribal groups in the Lower 48 and the 20 distinct cultural groups of Alaska Native people; and be cognizant of some of the special economic, geographic and educational conditions that exist in the State of Alaska.

Research Components

Based on these considerations, I determined that the following three research components were necessary to provide the kind of data that would enable me to respond to my research question, and to provide a frame of analysis for the issues raised.

1. Historical Account of Schooling for Alaska Native People

A small, but significant, component of my research design has been the preparation of a brief historical account of schooling for Alaska Native people. This is included in Chapter 4 and is presented in the wider framework of federal Native American policies. This chapter provides information on the contemporary social, political and economic conditions that are critical for understanding and interpreting some of the unique circumstances of the Alaska context.

Providing the historical context of Native American/Alaska Native schooling is important in examining the experiences of Alaska Native students at UAF for the following reasons: (1) despite the unique legal standing recognizing the aboriginal rights of Native people and the federal government's binding treaty obligations to Native Americans (which have been extended in large part to Alaska Natives), there continue to be many misunderstandings about the status and rights of Alaska Natives with regard to public education, health, social and economic services; (2) the history of Native American education is *not* the same as the history of Alaska Native education, and the differences are significant;

(3) students' prior schooling experiences influence their performance in a university setting, and the schooling experiences of many Alaska Native students at UAF are different from those of most other students in the United States; and (4) even though Alaska is the state with the largest percentage of Native Americans and the fifth largest numerically, most of the books written about Native education focus on *Indian* education in the *Lower 48* states.

Chapter 4 provides the necessary context for understanding and interpreting the assumptions that have guided the development of policies, programs and services for Alaska Native students at UAF, and the schooling experiences of Native students currently enrolled at UAF.

2. Alaska Native Programs, Student Services and Academic Coursework at the Fairbanks Campus of the University of Alaska Fairbanks

The second component of this study is a review and discussion of the development of Alaska Native programs, student services and academic coursework on the Fairbanks Campus of UAF. In Chapter 5, I examine the UAF campus context and describe UAF's responses to its changing student population in relation to those made in other institutions. The discussion makes it evident that conflicts have developed within the UAF community as it has attempted to balance its role as a research university with its obligations as a comprehensive land grant institution which is charged with the responsibility of meeting the needs of all of the citizens of the state—including an increasingly heterogeneous student population. Descriptions of Alaska Native programs, student services and coursework, and a review of the ambiguity that has surrounded their development and continuation, make it evident that this contextual information is essential for understanding and interpreting the students' experiences that are presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

3. University Experiences of 50 Alaska Native Teacher Education Graduates

The third and most significant component of this study consists of the documentation and analysis of the experiences of Alaska Native students who completed the majority of their academic work on the Fairbanks campus of UAF and graduated with a major or a minor in teacher education between May of 1989 and May of 1993—50 students in all. Although much of the research in this study is applicable to students in any academic field of study, I chose to limit the group to teacher education students as a way to reduce the variables, and in recognition of the fact that the university experiences of students in a teacher education program are different to the extent that they are required to spend a significant amount of time outside the university setting while completing student teaching and other practicum experiences.

I use "graduation" as my operational definition of academic success because it provides a logical and discrete means of identifying a group of students, and it is the most frequently used criterion of success in higher education research. This is in no way meant to imply that students who did not graduate were "failures." I believe that Alaska Native students have many reasons for coming to, and leaving, the university that do not lend themselves to conventional notions of success or failure.

Using students' university records, I assembled a data base for all 50 students on 84 variables (e.g. age, first language, courses taken, major, semesters in attendance, home community, GPA, high school size, attendance at other universities, test scores). I gathered additional in-depth experiential data from 24 students through open-ended interviews.

I also drew upon my many years of experience with both Native and non-Native students in a variety of roles, including instructor for teacher education courses, instructor for an Alaska Native high school bridging program, academic advisor, faculty advisor for a Native student education association, pre-school and special education teacher, and researcher in six studies related to Alaska Native education. Chapters 6 and 7 are built upon information that has been integrated from the data base, from student interviews and from my role as a participant observer.

The final chapter is a synthesis of Chapters 1 through 7 presented as a summary of the factors that helped the 50 students in this group to be academically successful, and as a set of recommendations that can be used by institutions, faculty, students and communities who are interested in developing campuses where Alaska Native, and other cultural minority students, can be fully represented, respected, involved and successful.

CHAPTER 2

MINORITY STUDENTS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

In May of 1993, at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, representatives of higher education institutions in Australia, Canada, Guatamala, New Zealand, Russia and the United States came together in Anchorage, Alaska to discuss issues of common concern. In the final session of the conference, Turoa Royal, a Maori delegate from the University of Raukawa (Te Wanagna o Raukawa) in New Zealand, reflected upon the events of the four-day conference, and summarized the sentiment of many of the participants when he said, "I thought Maori people were the only ones that had these problems, but I find the issues that confront us are shared by the world. . . We have a commonality of challenges" (Royal, 1993).

We can all learn a great deal from reading about and observing higher education efforts in other communities, countries and continents. What is happening at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, and other United States' institutions today, is not unique, although for participants in the midst of an institutional controversy it may seem so. Therefore, it is essential that we listen to, and learn from, the experiences of people in other institutions in other places. It would be foolish not to share our problems and our concerns, but more importantly, it would be shortsighted not to share our solutions. With academic disciplinary boundaries shifting almost as rapidly as countries' political boundaries, and with technology allowing for fast and inexpensive communication, even in many areas of the Third World, it is essential that we understand our shared history and begin to connect more with one another as we seek solutions to common concerns.

In this chapter I examine the literature that has helped me to better understand: (1) the higher education experiences of indigenous people in other countries and minority groups in the United States, and (2) the variety of research approaches that have been used to document those experiences. The insights drawn from this literature have contributed to the development of my research design and have provided a larger context in which to interpret the experiences of indigenous people in Alaska.

Comparative Education: A Commonality of Challenges

The literature that usually falls under the label of "comparative education" refers, in its broadest connotation, to an eclectic body of work that focuses upon the experiences of people in educational institutions across a wide variety of national contexts. The comparative education literature that has been most useful for this research has been that which describes the efforts of people in Third World countries who are struggling to develop higher education institutions that will respond to the needs of their own people in their own way, as well as that of indigenous people in what is sometimes described as the Fourth World (i.e. colonized people within industrialized nations) who are actively involved in their own institutional development efforts. A review of some of the comparative education literature reveals strong parallels between the experiences and contexts of Alaska Native people and those of people in many Third and Fourth World countries who are making the transition from colonial status to independent self-government and who are in the process of developing higher education institutions that are responsive to the needs of their own diverse cultures.

The cross-national higher education literature provides information on alternative types of educational initiatives and allows us to examine United States policies and practices with a broader, and hopefully less ethnocentric, viewpoint. This literature also makes it apparent that many of the issues faced by Alaska Natives are frequently more similar to those of indigenous people in other industrialized countries (e.g. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden) than to other minority groups in the United States. The perspectives drawn from comparative education have provided me not only with information relevant to my research study, but more importantly with an expanded conceptual framework in which to conduct my research. Many people who work and write in this field address education issues from a holistic, relational, interpretive, and participatory perspective, all of which I have found especially helpful in shaping my own theoretical concepts and research methodologies.

The theoretical and analytical work of Philip Altbach addressing higher education in Third World settings (1974, 1979, 1982, 1989, 1992) has been especially relevant to my research. His work highlights the fact that in most Third World countries that have gained independence over the past 50 years, the establishment of a national university system has been one of the primary arenas of conflict between Western and non-Western ideological and institutional perspectives. Altbach's global orientation is also clearly evident in the comparative analysis he brings to bear in his case studies of racial divisions at Columbia, Stanford, Arizona State and Cornell (Altbach & Lobotney, 1991).

John Ogbu, whose interdisciplinary orientation spans the fields of anthropology and education, comparative education, and sociology of education, offers additional comparative perspectives that are relevant to my research, particularly in his work on the participation of minority groups in formal education systems (1983, 1987, 1992). His typology of minority groups is perhaps the most widely recognized—and most frequently debated—component of his research. He distinguishes between three categories of minorities: autonomous minorities (i.e. Jews, Mormons); immigrant/voluntary minorities (i.e. Asians, Italian Americans, Hispanics); and subordinate/involuntary/castelike minorities (i.e. people who did not *choose* to become members of a particular society, such as Blacks and indigenous peoples). This typology has relevance for my research primarily because it helps identify qualities and distinctions between and among minority groups that need to be taken into account in research related to minorities and schooling. This is a particularly important consideration in Alaska where many of the policies affecting the state's largest minority group, Alaska Natives, have been modeled after those designed for other minorities in the United States, especially Blacks and Hispanics. Even policies developed to serve Indian people in the Lower 48 do not always translate well to Alaska Natives. There are numerous problems inherent in adopting policies based on the generic label of minority status, but this is a practice that is frequently followed in schools throughout the United States. Ogbu's work lays the groundwork for the importance of paying attention to the complex variables that need to be taken into account in this particular area.

Several African writers, including Alf Andrew Heggoy (1984), Ali Mazrui (1984) and Issa Omari (1991), have also provided useful perspectives for examining contemporary issues facing minority students in higher education. (Although frequently used even in Third World literature, the term *minority* is a curiously inappropriate label for people who represent 99 percent of the population in their own homelands.) The many issues examined by these and other authors suggest that there are fundamental differences that surface when non-Western people attempt to utilize Western institutions to address their own unique culturally-based needs and aspirations. Their writings reaffirm that the challenges of developing appropriate and meaningful higher education systems in countries with culturally heterogeneous non-Western populations are many of the same challenges faced by minority groups and institutions in the United States. Issues related to equity, hegemony and human rights are common features of the debate as policy-makers make choices about programs and services. The challenges of resolving fundamental tensions between rural and urban, traditional and modern, tribal and individual, subsistence and market-based, become readily apparent when attempts are made to develop a monolithic system in which diverse groups of people can participate equally.

The powerful and convincing parallels in the issues that confront Alaska Natives at UAF and indigenous people in other parts of the world became quite evident during presentations at the 1993 International Conference on Higher Education for Indigenous People in Anchorage, Alaska. Many of the speakers from the six countries represented focused on one or more of the following themes during their presentations (all of which have direct relevance to Alaska): (1) a shared history of oppression and forced assimilation, (2) "flaxroots/grassroots" reform movements, and (3) backlash or "whitelash." Because the insights of these participants have direct bearing on issues related to minority participation and success in majority institutions, but are not yet published, I have summarized some of the relevant points from the oral presentations.

In a keynote address, Ranganui Walker, Head of the Maori Studies Department at the University of Auckland, documented the repercussions of colonial expansion for indigenous people in countries around the world. These included disease, population collapse, religious conversion, treaty-making, military invasion, cultural erosion, language decline and suppression, and political subjugation—all consequences that are easily verified for Alaska Natives and American Indians as well. Verna Vos, Director of the Institute of Applied Aborignal Studies at Edith Cowan University in Western Australia, reminded people that it is not necessary to go back to early colonial times to document oppression as she described how Aboriginal people were not allowed to become citizens of Australia until 1967.

Sonny Mikaere from the Te Rangakura Teacher Training Institute in New Zealand described several reform movements, which he referred to as "flaxroots" initiatives that have been responsible for changing conditions in Maori educational institutions. These programs, such as the very successful Te Kohango Reo (Language Nest) pre-school Maori language programs, have been initiated, controlled and managed by the Maori people themselves. Walker, too, emphasized the critical importance of the efforts of people outside the mainstream system, and pointed to the development of the Te Kohango Reo as an example of one of the "biggest political movements in New Zealand."

Mikaere also talked about the "whitelash" (i.e. backlash) that has developed in many places where indigenous reforms have been successfully initiated. He provided examples of ways in which universities are showing their reluctance to adopt or support programs that challenge the standard way of doing things and described how he and his colleagues are pursuing the development of an International Certificate for Indigenous Studies with accreditation through an international indigenous body. Margaret Valadian, Director of the Aboriginal Education Centre' at the University of Wollongong, reinforced this position when she stated that Australian Aboriginals must custom design their higher education programs.

"This does not mean that we have to discard our heritage. Rather it means that what we learn has to be added to, or accommodated within, the pre-existing framework of our own educational background. . . . We need to reconnect the grandparent generation and the student generation today. We can do this through higher education by linking the principles and practice of the traditional past with the technology and new knowledge of today. . . .[Elders] should not have to be the unsung informants of others. They should be recognized and recorded as educators in their own right."

Walker described some of the unwritten policies that are operative in higher education today and indicated that in many institutions the only indigenous people that are hired are those "whose value system is Pakeha" or European. He indicated that "indigenous university appointments are conservative," and faculty who pose no threat and who will "continue with the hegemonic role" are appointed. He also commented that "isolated appointments [for indigenous faculty in university systems] are very lonely jobs."

Representatives from several First Nations higher education programs in Canada contributed information on a variety of initiatives that have been implemented in mainstream institutional settings to support goals that First Nations people have identified as important (Kirkness & R. Barnhardt, 1991; Tehenepee, 1992). Verna Kirkness, who was director of the First Nations House of Learning at the University of British Columbia, described one of the most important functions of First Nations programs as "demystifying the university to First Nations' communities and demystifying the communities to the university" and she identified "peer support and a physical place where people can meet" as being crucial to the success of First Nations students in university settings.

Some of the underlying assumptions that appear in the comparative education literature as well as in many of the presentations at the International Conference, can be summarized as follows.

- Cross-cultural and cross-national comparisons of educational systems must be made in a spirit of cooperation and collaboration, rather than being judgmental and evaluative. The goal is to learn from one another, not to develop a single prescriptive solution.

- A pluralistic perspective is essential. This is expressed by support and advocacy for the legitimacy of a wide range of world views, and a respect for diversity and heterogeneity.
- Research and analysis should be collaborative and participatory whenever appropriate (i.e. from UNESCO officials working with education ministry personnel at the national level to classroom teachers working with parents and students at the local level). A spirit of mutual learning must be evident.
- Cultural analysis provides a primary basis for explaining, predicting, and planning.
- Research must be drawn from a multi-disciplinary perspective.

Even a brief review of the comparative education literature and the emerging work of indigenous people in higher education confirms that the world has become small enough, and interdependent enough, that it is now essential (and not just an academic luxury) that we draw upon the perspectives and resources of people from multiple disciplines and from other countries in order to address what the comparative educator Bruce Fuller (1991) describes as "deepening and collectively-held social problems." His comments reinforce the necessity of thinking globally while acting locally.

> The contradiction between the press for modernity versus respect for local pluralism confronts Third-World states with particular clarity. Yet central governments throughout Europe and North America also are struggling for legitimacy in the face of growing counterforces: a broadening rainbow of ethnic diversity, an increasing political strength of pluralistic groups, a widening recognition that central bureaucracies erode local community, and a failure of individualistic action (via markets) to address deepening, collectively-held social problems (p. 136).

The insights about the best ways to solve issues related to accommodating diversity in higher education at home just might come from afar.

Minority Students in Higher Education in the United States

In this section I present a brief overview of what we know about the participation and experiences of minority students in higher education in the United States and how we know it. I also examine some of the implications of changing demographics and changing research approaches for policy and practice.

The overall system of higher education in the United States is the largest in the world, and one of the most complex. In contrast to the centralized systems in most countries, higher education in the United States has evolved into a highly diversified system that includes over 3,500 distinct institutions. Although higher education has been established in the United States for 345 years (since the founding of Harvard College in 1645), some of the most dramatic changes have occurred in the past 50 years. The purposes, goals and structures of contemporary American higher education institutions have been subjected to continuing challenges since the end of WW II when the first wave of "non-traditional" students appeared on American campuses as a result of the GI Bill (Boyer, 1987; Carnegie Foundation, 1990; Geiger, 1986; Kerr, 1991; Mayhew, 1969; P. Smith, 1990).

One of the most consequential forces impacting higher education in the United States has occurred because of the significant change in the demographics of student populations and the shift from a fairly homogeneous group of young white students to a far more diverse group of students with regard to gender, age, race, ethnicity, culture and religion. Females now account for over 50 percent of undergraduate enrollment. Ethnic and cultural minority students represent approximately 18 percent of the total higher education population, and in some traditionally mainstream (or "majority") institutions (e.g. University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Los Angeles) Caucasian students are now a minority (Bunzel, 1992; Cass & Cass-Liepmann, 1994; Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1990; United States Department of Education, 1990a, 1990b).

The increase in enrollment of ethnic and cultural minority students in higher education came about in the 1960s and 1970s, parallel with the Civil Rights Movement and the Great Society Programs. In much of the early literature that described these changes, minority students were frequently melded together and characterized as members of a single group of "minority students." The groups most commonly placed in this classification and identified as "minorities" were Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans, with little mention of Asian-Americans. (The term "minority" was, and continues to be, used almost exclusively to describe racial, ethnic or cultural groups whose minority status is based not only on numerical representation, but on political, economic and social status relative to a white majority.)

Some studies did include data which distinguished students as members of distinct racial or ethnic groups (Altman & Snyder, 1970; Astin, 1982; Brown & Stent, 1977). However, most related to policies and programs for Black students—a logical development since they represented the largest ethnic minority group in the United States at the time and because they played the leading roles in the legal and political events of the Civil Rights era (e.g. Fleming, Gill & Swinton, 1978; Thomas, 1981). Sociologists, in particular, made significant research contributions to the literature about Black students in higher education as even a cursory review of sociology journals from this period will confirm. Many of these studies were of a quantitative nature where the focus of analysis was on two areas of students' university experiences: access and outcome—with little attention given to that which occurred in between. There was much less written about students from other minority groups, especially Native Americans who had only minimal representation in higher education institutions at the time.

Changing Demographics

During the late 1980s and now in the 1990s, additional minority-related issues have moved into a central position and are at the heart of higher education challenges, as the following recent comments suggest.

- Racial tensions have become a crisis on some campuses, and sadly, we [have gained] the unmistakable impression that the push for social justice that so shaped the priorities of higher education during the 1960s has dramatically diminished. (Boyer, 1990, p. 2)
- The central message is that higher education, in its policies toward minorities and its treatment of them, has been found wanting, and that there have been, and will be, even more serious consequences. . . the greatest single imperative before American higher education currently is to improve its performance in this crucial area. (Kerr, 1991 in Altbach & Lomotey, p. vii)
- America is moving backward—not forward—in its effort to achieve the full participation of minority citizens in the life and prosperity of the nation. . . . The issue of minority participation is higher education's most important priority. (Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life, 1988)

Support for minority students in higher education in the 1960s and 1970s was followed by a period of retrenchment and backlash during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Their policies openly supported legal and legislative action that challenged some of the educational initiatives of the original Civil Rights Movement, such as affirmative action, bilingual education, desegregation measures, and race-specific financial aid policies. During the later years of the Reagan/Bush era, the academic debate about minority student participation was fueled and brought to the public's attention by the widely distributed writings of conservative social critics such as Allan Bloom (1987), Dinesh D'Soza (1991), E. D. Hirsch (1987), R. Kimball (1992) and Charles Sykes (1988) with their attacks on multiculturalism and their arguments that liberal politics had corrupted colleges and universities in the United States.

The increase of racially-related incidents on campuses all across the United States, and subsequent analyses of these actions, suggests that many people who thought the minority problem might simply "go away" after the 1960s, or those who operated with the belief that all minorities would meld into the mythical melting pot, are now having to face the demographic reality that the White non-Latino population continues to decline in relation to other racial/ethnic groups (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education & The College Board, 1991). In fact, the number and proportion of minority people in the United States has continued to increase rapidly and predictions are that by the year 2000, 1 in 3 United States citizens will identify themselves as a member of an ethnic minority group. The Black population increased 12 percent between 1980 and 1990 and continues to be the largest racial minority group with 12 percent of the nation's population. The Hispanic population increased 53 percent, and in 1990 represented over 9 percent of the total population. Asian Americans are the fastest-growing population group in the United States today, mostly through immigration, and they now represent approximately 3 percent of the population. The American Indian/Alaskan Native population is the smallest racial/ethnic group in the United States, but it increased significantly (21 percent) between 1980 and 1990, and today there are more than 2 million Native Americans, or about 2 percent of the United States population. (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education & The College Board, 1991).

Although there are increasing numbers of students from these minority groups participating in higher education and moving into positions of influence throughout society today, there is strong evidence to suggest that Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans continue to be disproportionately under-represented and do not have equal access to, and/or opportunities for success in, education or employment (Green, 1989; Mingle, 1987; United States Department of Education, 1990a, 1990b; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and The College Board, 1991).

Expanded Research Approaches

Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini (1991) identified some of the inherent problems that have prevented us from gaining a better understanding of minority students' participation in higher education after they examined nearly 3,000 higher education research studies. They concluded that "The evidence [in these studies] has a bias because it focuses largely on non-minority students of traditional college age" (p. 13). They called for more holistic and interdisciplinary approaches and expressed concern that "a number of [the 3,000] studies reflect little familiarity with the knowledge base outside the author's main disciplinary paradigm" (p. 633). They recommended that researchers bring a new orientation to their studies and begin to look for and be sensitive to what they describe as "indirect causes" for student success or failure by extending their research designs to include more than traditional cause and effect relationships.

Patrick Callan, vice president of the Education Commission of the States, identifies another problem that has continued to impede our ability to develop appropriate policies and programs for minority students, and that is the serious lack of accurate statistical information.

> We have been greatly disturbed by the lack of current data on enrollments, degrees and other facets of American higher education that provide a portrait of the progress made by minorities. With the enormity of the task facing American higher education in evaluating its success in the recruitment, retention and graduation of minorities, this should no longer be tolerated. Too often the parties involved—the institutions which collect the data, the states which compile it and the federal government which reports it—have approached the issue from a 'compliance' perspective.
>
> This is not enough. Commitment, not compliance, will be needed to turn the American dream into an American reality. (Mingle, 1987, p. v.)

Researchers from a broader range of social science disciplines are beginning to respond to the call for more encompassing and expanded research approaches by moving beyond the highly visible and easily quantifiable indicators. There is evidence of this shift in an increasing number of long-term, qualitative, interdisciplinary studies.

Some of the groups that have been most instrumental in providing impetus and support for a more integrated and holistic approach to research on minority student participation in higher education include the American Council on Education (ACE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, through its direct support of research in higher education, also provides indirect support for research related to minority participation and success in colleges and universities. In addition, Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, which is published under the editorial leadership of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), has devoted some issues to matters of minority participation in higher education (e.g. Volume 24, Number 1, 1992; Volume 25, Number 2, 1993).

In 1987 the Board of Directors of the American Council on Education convened a special meeting to consider how higher education could take a leadership role in "rekindling the nation's commitment to the full participation of minority citizens" (Green, p.vii). From this meeting the ACE Board and the Education Commission of the States initiated the "Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life," out of which came the report, One-Third of a Nation (1988). The message of the report was that "America is moving backward—not forward—in its efforts to achieve the full participation of minority citizens in the life and prosperity of the nation" (p. 3). One of the direct outcomes of this assessment was the commissioning of Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity (Green, ed., 1989). This handbook provides information on strategies that have worked on a variety of campuses and suggests that the conditions for successfully involving minority students hinge on three variables: involvement and commitment of college and university administrative leaders, development of an integrated approach to change, and institutional change. The American Council on Education also makes an on-going contribution by publishing an annual status report on minority participation in education.

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit, nationwide interstate compact formed in 1965, whose primary purpose is to help governors, state legislators, state education officials and others develop policies to improve the quality of education at all levels. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are members (Montana is not). This group's work on minority issues in higher education has generated a series of reports, journal articles and books (e.g. Richardson, 1989, 1990, 1991; Richardson, Matthews & Finney, 1992; Richardson & Skinner, 1990, 1991; Mingle, 1987). The State Higher Education Executive Officers is a nationwide association of the chief executive officers serving state-level coordinating boards and governing boards associated with post secondary education. Their membership includes 49 states, the district of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Canadian province of Quebec.

In 1987 two reports were jointly published by the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers that advocated strongly for state government involvement and leadership in helping minorities to achieve full participation in higher education. In Focus on Minorities: Trends in Higher Education Participation and Success, James Mingle provides a statistical overview of the status of minorities in higher education over the past 30 years and provides accompanying interpretive information. His report makes clear that "progress is distressingly stalled," and there is "strong evidence that we are losing ground in the effort to make full participation of minority students in colleges and universities a reality." Mingle states that "America faces not only a moral mandate but an economic necessity when it seeks to include all of its citizens in a quality post secondary education . . . [if we fail to do so] we will not only create a permanent underclass of American citizens but also risk social and economic dissolution that will affect us all" (1987, p. v). Although the report shows that overall minority enrollment increased 21 percent from 1976 to

1984 (nearly three times the rate of Whites), much of the increase occurred *before* 1980, and from 1980 to 1984, Black enrollment declined, as did that of Native Americans. Mingle also indicates that the few research studies he was able to find and review "are in no way conclusive about the institutional factors that lead to minority academic success. Most institutional efforts remain unevaluated" (p. 23).

The companion piece, Focus on Minorities: Synopsis of State Higher Education Initiatives (Mingle, 1987), was prepared with information gathered from a survey of the State Higher Education Executive Officers members which asked about state- or system-level initiatives targeted at minorities. Thirty-three states responded to the survey (Alaska was not one of them), and the report provides summaries of the major initiatives in each of the responding states, but not at specific institutions. It includes a list of documents that are available from each state, and provides a useful sampling of initiatives and addresses for resource material.

In 1989 the National Task Force for Minority Achievement in Higher Education was formed by the American Council on Education and the State Higher Education Executive Officers to identify and advance policies that contribute to the participation and achievement of minority students in higher education. The group included educators and state policy makers who worked together for a year and a half. Their final report (National Task Force for Minority Achievement in Higher Education, 1990) concludes that full minority participation and achievement requires coordinated and sustained commitment from states and universities, and the role of the federal government should be to stimulate and support policies and practices in states and on campuses that "offer the greatest promise for successfully educating more minority students" (p. v).

The work of Richard Richardson and several colleagues, through the Education Commission of the States and in conjunction with the former National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance at Arizona State University, provides not only information, but a useful research model for studying the issue of minority participation. They conducted a major five-year study that included case studies of 10 public colleges and universities with good records of graduating African Americans, Hispanics or American Indians (Richardson and Skinner, 1991). The information from these case studies was then used to develop a survey in which 142 public, four-year institutions in 10 states provided information about the institutional practices associated with high or improved "equity outcomes" during the 1980s. These 10 states were home to 42 percent of the nation's population in 1985, and together they enrolled 39 percent of all American Indian college students, 42 percent of all African Americans, and 72 percent of all Hispanics.

Richardson's final report of this five-year study, Promoting Fair College Outcomes: Learning From the Experiences of the Past Decade (1991), includes both a micro and macro analysis of the data. His conclusions correspond with those of several other recent studies that have sought to identify characteristics of programs and policies leading to increased equity in access, retention, achievement and outcome for minority students (e.g. Green, 1989; Smith, 1989; Spitzberg and Thorndike, 1992). He states that higher levels of administrative commitment, greater use of strategic planning, more careful attention to institutional outcomes for minorities, and greater emphasis on staff diversity were present in those institutions that recorded the greatest gains in participation and graduation rates for African Americans and Hispanics. These institutions also reported more extensive and more systematic use of strategies to: (1) reduce barriers to minority participation, (2) help students achieve high expectations, and (3) make learning environments more responsive to cultural diversity (1990, p. vi). He concludes that the results of this investigation "demonstrate clearly that diversity and quality need not be pursued as mutually exclusive objectives. Given a supportive state climate, institutions can attain both through committed leadership and systematic interventions" (p. vii). In a related article, Richardson and Skinner (1990) recommend a more careful analysis of "relevant practices in the experiences of other institutions" and deride much of the current literature on minority higher education because it suggests "ready-made 'cookbook' strategies that can be used without regard for the unique circumstances of each college" (p. 507).

Richardson's holistic and interdisciplinary approach to research design and analysis reflects a constructive response to some of the weaknesses identified by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) in their review and analysis of research on students' experiences in colleges, mostly notably the tendency of researchers to rely on a positivistic, quantitative approach to inquiry. Although they conclude that this paradigm served researchers well in the past, they state that important "fine-grained" work is called for now, and they refer to the "important inroads that are being made by scholars trained as sociologists and anthropologists" (p. 632).

Although the work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has not focused specifically on minority students, the research supported by this group has contributed significantly to a better understanding of the experiences of minority students on campuses in the United States. In 1990, the Foundation cooperated with the American Council on Education and published a special report Campus Life: In Search of Community. This report proposed six principles that "defined the kind of community every college and university should strive to be." Their third principle states that a college or university must be "a just community, a place where the sacredness of the person is honored and where diversity is aggressively pursued" (p. 7). The authors of the report argue that in the coming decade colleges and universities must "commit themselves to increase the enrollment of minority students so that their participation in higher education at least matches their representation in the population . . . this vision of the college or university as a just community must be aggressively pursued, since it is becoming increasingly apparent that time is running out" (p. 35).

In 1992, Irving Spitzberg and Virginia Thorndike, the two principal researchers on the year-long Carnegie Study, published their own book, Creating Communication on College Campuses. The book is based upon material from the original Carnegie study and from the results of three national surveys conducted in 1989: an update of the 1984 Carnegie survey, "The Condition of the Professoriate," a joint survey with the American Council on Education in which college and university presidents were asked about their views on the current condition of student life, and a survey of chief student affairs officers organized by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in cooperation with the American Council on Education.

Spitzberg and Thorndike's (1992) effort to examine "undergraduate experience of community" by using the following three foci makes their book especially relevant for those of us interested in the factors that influence the experiences of minority students in higher education: (1) student diversity, particularly racial and ethnic diversity and the climate on campus for women students; (2) individual and small-group rights and responsibilities in relation to institutional authority; (3) student-faculty relations and the learning community. Their recommendations call for creating a "revitalized, pluralistic learning community, not looking backward to a Golden Age that never was" (p. xv). They emphasize that, although "a house divided against itself cannot stand," universities today are "pluralistic houses [that] must contain rooms of their own for the many subcommunities that wish to express their difference" (p. 190).

Finally, Daryl Smith's book, The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy?, commissioned by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education (1989), provides a comprehensive review of the ways that institutions can improve the experiences of minority students—and more specifically, how they can organize for diversity. Like Richardson, Smith examines the implications of the perceived conflict between quality and diversity and concludes that this misperception is one of "the most compelling arguments for reshaping questions and discourse about this topic. . . it requires a reframing of meaning of quality, definition of standards, performance criteria and assessment" (p. vii). The question that she raises in the title of her book became a central theme for my research, as it framed the issues institutions face in their attempts to develop campus environments where all students can be fully represented and successful.

Native Americans in Higher Education

The literature focusing specifically on Native Americans in higher education appears to have followed a pattern similar to that addressing the participation of other minority students in higher education. Much of the material written in the last three decades provides detailed descriptions of new and innovative programs for Native American students, but there are few long term, qualitative research studies. Many of the writings suggest a sense of optimism—a conviction that Native students can, and will, be successful if universities make changes that take into account their special interests. The Journal of American Indian Education and the Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education provide an important forum for the circulation of many of these ideas (Beaty & Chiste, 1986; Brown, 1980; Clark, 1972; Crum, 1989; Davis, 1992; Falk & Aitken, 1984; Forbes, 1985; Garcia & Eubank, 1976; Hornett, 1989; Knowles, Gill, Beauvais & Medearis, 1992; Lin, 1990; Otis, 1980; Patton & Edington, 1973; Reyhner, Lee & Gabbard, 1993; Wells, 1989).

In the last few years, however, there has been a shift in both the content and tone of some of the academic writings about Native American education. Articles have taken on a more critical perspective, and alternative explanations for the continued low participation and lack of success of Native American students in higher education are being offered. Recommendations are moving beyond the surface-level changes that institutions can make to far more complex issues related to cultural discontinuity, empowerment, legacies of colonialism, and individual and institutional racism (Adams, 1988; Carnegie Foundation, 1989; Duchene, 1988; Hampton, 1989; Jensen, 1984; Kawagley, 1994; Kidwell, 1991; Locust, 1988; Pottinger, 1989; Tierney, 1991, 1992, 1993b; Tierney & Wright, 1991, Wright, 1990).

Kathryn Tijerina and Paul Biemer's work (1988), and also that of Vine Deloria (1991), provide syntheses and overviews of many of the issues currently being addressed by those writing about Native Americans and higher education. They present interpretations that resonate with the voices of many other contemporary writers, and their analyses serve as a link between earlier studies and the more current ones. Some of the key issues they address include the significant differences and discontinuities between Native American cultures and the majority culture as reflected in schools and universities, the movement away from affirmative action and preference for Native hire by the federal government, growing national indifference to civil rights, and increasing tolerance of institutional racism. The title of the Tijerina and Biermer article "The Dance of Indian Higher Education: One Step Forward and Two Steps Back" (1988) captures well the current status of Native American higher education programs and policies as depicted in several recent works.

William Tierney's recent (1992) study on Native Americans in higher education, Official Encouragement: Institutional Discouragement, reinforces Tijerina and Biermer's assessment. He examines the experiences of undergraduate Native American students enrolled in a variety of different higher education institutional settings and challenges the "persistence" theories of Vincent Tinto (1987) who asserts that students must "socially as well as physically disassociate themselves from the communities of the past" in order to be successful in university settings. He refutes this argument and suggests instead that there are alternative routes to success when institutions build environments where the lives of minority students are "celebrated and affirmed throughout the culture of the institution (1993b, p. 322). His recommendations call for actions that lead to organizational change and student empowerment.

> Academe must do more than officially encourage students to attend college on mainstream society's terms, for when this is done Indian students generally encounter institutional discouragement. Instead, participants in academic organizations need to develop rituals of empowerment that enable American Indian students to celebrate their culture and become critically engaged in the life of the institution, their tribes, their families, and themselves. To do so offers American society vast potential for the 21st century and fulfills an obligation to Native Americans that has yet to be met. (p. 165)

Don-Paul Benjamin and Stephen Chambers (1989) work represents another study that attempts to look beyond statistics to explain students' experiences. They conducted a four-year research project with 70 Native American freshmen who entered a four-year comprehensive university in the fall of 1984. During the study, they identified patterns regarding persistence and attainment of both Native American and non-Native American students that contradicted some of the commonly-held assumptions in higher education about what it takes to succeed in college. They found that "something else appears to be operating among Native Americans; something for which present measures appear unable to account" (p. 12). In an effort to identify that "something else," they interviewed 11 students and organized the interviews according to three themes (which appear to have been identified by the researchers prior to the interviews). They included frequency and reasons for "going home" during school times, consequences of late recruitment practices for otherwise non-college bound students, and the tension for students that comes with efforts to adopt university "white" traits while attempting to maintain their traditional perspectives. Based on the interviews and other data they gathered, they concluded that they would need to expand their study to a larger group and take "a cross-cultural/multi-cultural approach" in order to develop a model that would account for cultural diversity (p. 21). They concluded that "Native Americans differ in persistence and educational attainment from most college students (including other ethnic minorities) and the reasons for these differences are not readily apparent" (p. 3). Their findings clearly indicate the need for continued research addressing the inconclusiveness they identified in their own research. It is hoped that my study will shed some light on these questions and offer insight into factors that contribute to Native student success at UAF.

Published information about Alaska Native student participation in higher education includes quantitative reports such as those that have provided general demographic information about the educational status of ethnic and racial minorities in Alaska (e.g. Kleinfeld, Gorsuch & Kerr, 1988), and an examination of postsecondary success rates of Native students based on the relationship between test scores, courses taken and grade point averages (e.g. Kleinfeld and Kohout, 1974). Studies and articles offering a more qualitative, descriptive perspective include those that focus on the experience of Alaska Native students participating in the UAF off-campus Cross-Cultural Education Development Program/X-CED (e.g. R. Barnhardt, 1977, in press; Harrison, 1982; Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991; Lipka, 1990, 1991, 1994; Madsen, 1990); and others that include information, but do not necessarily focus, on some of the experiences of Alaska Native students on the Fairbanks campus (e.g. Delpit, 1988; Gilmore & Smith, 1989; Scollon, 1981). A doctoral dissertation by Louis Jacquot in 1974 provides historical information on the context of higher education for Alaska Native students prior to 1972. Current doctoral research by Wendy Esmailka (1994) on the experiences of Athabaskan female students at UAF and by Michael Jennings on the development of rural campuses in the UAF system will provide important additional contemporary perspectives.

Comments

Several patterns emerge from this review of the status of cultural minority students in higher education, and from the brief examination of some of the research approaches being used to document these experiences. It is evident that there is no disagreement among experts about the changing demographics, and although the voices of those who are threatened by increasing diversity and the notion of multiculturalism are louder than in the past, there is little debate, or doubt, that issues surrounding diversity have assumed a central position in the policy making arenas of institutions, countries and worldwide organizations.

We also know that colleges and universities are having only minimal success in their attempts to provide environments that encourage and allow students from cultural minority groups to stay in school and to graduate. It is clear that in many institutions more time and resources are used for recruiting additional students than are used for helping those who are already enrolled. In most colleges and universities where "success" has been achieved, students have borne the major responsibility in adapting to meet the demands of the universities, but there is an emerging call for institutions to begin to accommodate and share responsibility for change.

The area in which there is the most agreement, however, revolves around *what we do not know*. The fact that we have so little accurate information or "empirical evidence" upon which to build policies and programs is highlighted in nearly every study. People deride not only the ambiguity and inaccuracy of the statistical information on minority students, but increasingly demand qualitative studies that will provide explanations for the trends suggested by the quantitative data. Few studies examine the issue of minority participation from the perspective of the student as well as the institution.

Many studies of minority students and higher education continue to meld together students from all ethnic and racial groups, while only a relatively small number provide an in-depth analysis of the experiences of single minority groups. This is especially true for minority students who attend school in a majority setting. Native American students are frequently not included in larger studies of minority students, and only rarely do the few studies that focus specifically on Native American students in higher education include Alaska Natives. The cross-national literature that focuses on the experiences of indigenous people in higher education is more likely to include reference to Alaska Natives than most of the United States-oriented studies of minority education. Many program and policy decisions, unfortunately, continue to be made on the basis of myths and stereotypes.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) state unequivocally that the future direction for research should be that growing proportion of students whom we have typically classified as "nontraditional," but who are rapidly becoming the majority participants in the American post secondary system. They caution that "Some of our most cherished notions about the determinants of impact may have little relevance to these students," and they indicate that researchers may need to revise their traditional ideas about what the impact of college really means for nontraditional students (p. 632). In addition, they offer the following suggestions about how this research should be done.

> An important direction of future research on college impact should be a greater dependence on naturalistic and qualitative methodologies. When employed judiciously, such approaches are capable of providing greater sensitivity to many of the subtle and fine-grained complexities of college impact than more traditional quantitative approaches. Naturalistic inquiries may be particularly sensitive to the detection of the kinds of indirect and conditional effects. We anticipate that in the next decade important contributions to our understanding of college impacts will be yielded by naturalistic investigations. (p. 634)

In the following chapter, I respond to Pascarella's and Terenzini's challenge by describing how the research tradition of anthropology and education has contributed to the development of the conceptual base for my research on Alaska Native students' experiences in higher education.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

Prior to leaving for graduate study at the University of British Columbia (UBC), I had questions in mind for a research study, and I had some ideas about how I might go about finding answers to my questions. As indicated previously, my interests revolved around the question, *What factors contribute to the academic success of Alaska Native teacher education students at the University of Alaska Fairbanks* ? which had grown out of my university teaching and research experiences with Native and non-Native students over a ten-year period. The issues I wanted to address were drawn from a "practical wisdom" perspective (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989, p. 4) gained from working closely with students within the university system. My concerns were a product of the kind of "ordinary knowledge" that Charles Lindblom and David Cohen (1979) describe as being an important tool for social scientists in addition to the "professional social inquiry" methods that are most frequently used for addressing social problems.

This common sense knowledge led me to recognize that insights and explanations about UAF programs and students' experiences would require a research design that would allow me to gather accurate data on UAF programs and policies, and detailed information on the experiences of a representative sample of successful Alaska Native students. In addition, it would be essential that I do whatever I could to ensure that this research would "do no harm" to the participants (Sizer, 1990).

Experiences in other educational arenas also influenced the formation of my questions and research design. I had been involved in education in various professional capacities for twenty-two years before beginning work on my Ph.D. In all of my teaching and research experiences I had worked with students and colleagues who were members of ethnic minority groups, and this helped to shape my notions of teaching and learning in a variety of ways. My work, as a speech pathologist, with Black students and Black teachers in the inner-city schools of Baltimore, Maryland led me to seriously question the behavioral conditioning model as the dominant model of education at the time (and the accompanying view that cultural and linguistic differences were deficits to be overcome); my teaching experiences with deaf and hard-of-hearing students in Fairbanks propelled me into sociolinguistics; and my work with Alaska Native students, teachers and faculty at the University of Alaska moved me toward ethnography in a cultural anthropology tradition. While living in New Zealand and Canada, my personal and professional experiences with Maori and First Nations people provided the impetus to look to comparative education, and particularly to the experiences of other indigenous people. In each of these educational settings, an overriding and always lingering question has been "why aren't public school systems able to serve certain groups of students as well as others?" In each of the settings in which I worked, the people whose ideas made the most sense to me were those who were asking contextual and relational questions within a qualitative framework, and generally from a tradition of cultural anthropology and/or sociolinguistics. Therefore when I began my doctoral work at UBC, I came with some familiarity of qualitative research based on past experience, and some expertise in the field of sociolinguistics from the work I completed for my master's degree (C. Barnhardt, 1981), but with no real understanding of how all of the various research traditions fit together. What I assumed was that I needed a research design that would allow me to do the following.

- Study a complex and dynamic social system
- Use culture as the framework for interpretation
- Conduct my research over an extended period of time
- Convey respect for the participants

The approach that appeared to be best suited to these needs was some variation of ethnography.

During my first year at UBC I spent a great deal of time thinking and learning about formal research traditions—and I focused on trying to understand how my intuitive hunches fit or did not fit with: (1) academic research models in the social sciences, particularly in educational research; and (2) research that had been done previously with minority students in higher education. As is evident from the literature review in Chapter 2, there are few precedents for doing qualitative research in higher education—most research has been quantitative in origin and most data have been drawn from the experiences of traditional mainstream students. The primary studies used to explain success and failure in higher education have been based on samples that have not included accurate representations of minority students. As William Tierney (1993b) makes evident in his analysis of Vincent Tinto's (1987) conventional explanatory model, and as Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini (1991) indicate in their work, the majority of research methodologies are simply not adequate to explain the experiences of cultural, ethnic and racial minority students in today's colleges and universities.

During my first doctoral seminar at UBC we were asked to introduce ourselves and to share something about the research issues and methodologies in which we were interested. Although some students' research ideas were more clearly formulated than others, all nine of us said that we were interested in using some form of qualitative methodology, and several of us described what we wanted to do as *ethnography*. The nods of agreement and acknowledgment from the three faculty members (representing the disciplines of history, philosophy and sociology) suggested approval for the direction in which we were interested in moving. Similar exchanges occurred in other classes, with students expressing an interest in doing qualitative research, with a particular emphasis on ethnography, and there was general agreement and approval from faculty members. I moved ahead and began to develop my research plans, naively assuming that the terms we were all brandishing about, especially qualitative and ethnographic, implied at least some consensus about what it was we wanted to do and how we would go about doing it. How mistaken I was.

By the end of my second term, I realized that faculty members from the education departments and from other social science disciplines had quite different perspectives on qualitative research in general and ethnography in particular, and several were not aware of alternative perspectives outside their own area of interest. Faculty members and visiting scholars with backgrounds in sociology, and especially those from the British "new school," touted Paul Willis' work (1977) as the seminal model of ethnographic work and assumed that all graduate students would be able to carry on academic conversations about "the lads" in Willis' study. Educators with a critical theory perspective linked ethnography with empowerment, and those with a neo-Marxist and/or feminist perspective focused primarily on gender, social class and race issues, with some advocating radical activist ethnography as a means of correcting imbalances in the social system. Educational psychologists, and other faculty with more traditional training, discussed ethnography as an approach that could add to, or build upon, quantitative studies, and they offered new techniques for analysis such as programs for computer coding of open-ended interviews. Educational historians either embraced ethnography because it reflected features of their own methodologies, or became defensive because, although it appeared to be similar, it was *not* the same. Comparative education practitioners had a more eclectic approach and endorsed the multiple perspectives and realities reflected in ethnography, while cultural anthropologists focused on cross-cultural comparisons, cultural interpretation, and the anthropology of education. *No one* talked about sociolinguistics or the ethnography of communication.

Initially, I was somewhat surprised about the wide-ranging sets of definitions and criteria used to describe "good" ethnography, and I wondered why there was not more interdisciplinary awareness and cross-fertilization. A year later, after weaving my way through a myriad of seminars, lectures, assignments, journal articles, books, and discussions with students and faculty members, I realized that what I was experiencing at the University of British Columbia was a microcosm of the debates taking place throughout the academic world of educational research in the 1990s. My personal puzzlement over "the real meaning" of ethnography simply reflected the reality of a still-evolving field of qualitative research processes, methodologies and products. Evidence for, and details of, this debate can be found in a myriad of studies (e.g. Adler & Adler, 1987; Atkinson, Delamont & Hammersley 1988; Eisner & Peshkin 1990; Erickson, 1986; Gage, 1989; Howe & Eisenhart, 1990; Jackson, 1990; Jacob, 1988; LeCompte, Millory & Preissle, 1992; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Mehan, 1992; Paulston, 1991; Sherman & Webb, 1988; Spindler, 1987; Van Maanen, 1988; Wolcott, 1990, 1992, 1994).

Unlike the more conventional notion of graduate study, many of us today are pursuing an academic career backwards—at least according to the traditional linear models that recommend and presume theory before practice. My previous experiences with "ethnographic" research had occurred primarily with people in education who were working from a cultural anthropology perspective, whereas at the University of British Columbia most of the graduate education faculty that I worked with had their disciplinary roots in sociology. This forced me to try and make sense of where these different views of ethnography did, or did not, fit together—and where all of this fit within the larger qualitative framework I had in mind for my own research.

In this chapter, therefore, I review and describe: (1) general trends within the qualitative educational research community, (2) my own research design/methodology, and (3) how and why my methodology fits into the ethnographic tradition as practiced in cultural anthropology and the subfield of anthropology and education.

Qualitative Educational Research: Multiple Approaches

Several of the social and political events of the 1960s (e.g. the Civil Rights Movement, the Great Society programs) had a significant influence in shaping what I perceive to be some of the major trends within the "qualitative community," particularly on those members of the community who were interested in education. (I have deliberately chosen *community* in an attempt to move beyond the roadblocks that so often dominate any discussions in which the term *paradigm* is used, and as a recognition of the shifting boundaries of academic disciplines—the "blurred genres" that Clifford Geertz describes (1983).) The trends that I perceive to be occurring within the qualitative community include: (1) a movement from a debate on quantitative vs. qualitative to a debate *within* the qualitative community; (2) an opportunity for educators to choose from a much broader selection of options for research and writing; and (3) an increased focus on the actual writing process.

The vocabulary used today to describe non-quantitative approaches to educational research and evaluation is confusing, but it is also informative. Discussions of terminology are now almost mandatory in education research books that include the term "qualitative" in their title (e.g. Eisner & Peshkin, 1990, LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Sherman & Webb, 1988; Wolcott, 1994) and in general research textbooks (Borg & Gall, 1983; LeCompte, Millroy & Preissle, 1992; McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). Unfortunately, in many qualitative studies themselves, the choice of labels is not even addressed. These new labels do however provide important clues about the development of the qualitative community, the nature of the evolving debate, and the new range of options for people interested in qualitative research. Even a quick review of the following labels, which I have gathered from people and texts, provides clues about the emerging qualitative community, and its processes and products. The following terms were all used to describe *qualitative* research. They were used as independent nouns or as a modifier of the word research or evaluation: action research, case study, constructivist, connoisseurship, critical ethnography, ethnology, ethnography, ethnography for empowerment, ethnography of communication, ethnomethodology, feminist, field research, field studies, interpretive ethnography, Marxist ethnography, micro-ethnography, naturalistic, non-interventionist, participant-observation, participatory research, phenomenology, postmodernism, symbolic interactionist and holistic.

What does such a list tell us? The qualitative community is attracting people from a wider variety of epistemological and theoretical perspectives, boundaries are expanding and being crossed, and the legitimate options and space in which to work and write have increased. This list also suggests that the most interesting current debate has shifted from the original quantitative/objective vs. qualitative/subjective debate to one *within* the qualitative community itself. Perhaps we have already moved into what N. L. Gage (1989) describes as a possible "peaceful reconciliation" (his "second stage") of the "paradigm wars" of the 1970s and 1980s. Other evidence of a shift in the debate includes the presence of new or changed journals in which the focus is intentionally qualitative. In just the past few years The International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education was initiated with international *and* interdisciplinary boards of editors; and the Journal of Urban Studies changed its name to the Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, made its editorial board explicitly interdisciplinary, and issued a statement that it is "the first journal in sociology dedicated to ethnography" (Adler & Adler, 1987, p. 4). In university settings, an increasing number of options are available for students and faculty who are interested in qualitative research, and advertisements for some faculty positions now specifically call for qualitative expertise. The requirements for graduate students in the educational policy program at the University of British Columbia appear to be representative of programs in many other research universities where the introductory graduate research class is co-taught by faculty members with qualitative and quantitative expertise and the primary research textbook includes a substantial qualitative research section (McMillan and Schumacher, 1989).

Although these examples do indicate substantive change in the place and position of qualitative research and evaluation practices, it is important to locate these changes within the larger educational research community and realize that the quantitative community continues to have a disproportionate influence in most education settings. The large percentage of articles published in the main education research journals and the presentations at many educational professional meetings continue to be quantitative. A large percentage of government research money continues to support quantitative research and evaluation—a decision based perhaps on financial and efficiency reasons as much as on any strong theoretical convictions.

The increase in options, and labels, for qualitative research is seen as a liability by some and as an asset by others. Jan-Ingvar Lofstedt (1990) calls for "terminological streamlining . .

. [because] far too many terms are now used to label the different paradigms and approaches, and some concepts are used differently by proponents of different approaches" (p. 79). Others celebrate the diversity and envision a qualitative community that is defined by its heterogeneity, pluralism and tolerance for the other (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990; Paulston, 1991; Sherman & Webb, 1988).

This "opening up of options in qualitative research" forces those of us who participate in qualitative, interdisciplinary educational research to explain and justify our research decisions more explicitly. The security of working within the orthodoxy of a single discipline with well defined research traditions is not an option, and we must defend our choices to people outside of our comfortable and often homogeneous networks.

In the next section I review the development, composition, and perspectives of what I perceive to be the two central ethnographic groups in the qualitative educational research community today: *critical ethnography* and *cultural anthropology ethnography*. Although others working in this area have prepared rigorous and far more detailed qualitative research typologies (e.g. Jacob, 1988, Paulston, 1991, Wolcott, 1992), my simple two-part grouping of ethnographies has helped me sort through current uses of ethnography in education, and it has helped me to formulate a research design that best address my research question. It also responds to Harry Wolcott (1990) who suggests that "anyone who engages in ethnography also assumes responsibility to participate in the continuing dialogue to define and redefine it both as process and as product" (p. 47).

Critical Ethnography

Critical ethnography developed from, and within, the *critical theory/critical pedagogy* tradition, and I use the term critical ethnography to represent the thinking and work of a wide range of people—including some who might not label their work as such. I use this term because it appears to be the label used most frequently in the literature (e.g. Anderson, 1989; Lather, 1986) to describe the theory *and* practice of a group of people who work within a larger sociological framework that has been informed by the work and writing of three primary groups: European social scientists (e.g. Bernstein, Bourdieu, Foucault, Gramsci) and Paulo Freire; those who identify with the interpretive movement (including phenomenologists, ethnomethodologists, and postmodernists); and the critical theorists and pedagogues. I have included in this category people and ideas from the British "new school of sociology" (also known as "the new sociology of education") because their work was instrumental in the formation of critical ethnography. McLaren (1989) in fact equates "the new sociology of education" with "a critical theory of education" (p. 159).

Most critical ethnographers today continue to work within a sociological framework; focus on the relationship between social class, race, and gender; and have as an important research goal a desire to "free individuals from sources of domination and repression" (Anderson, 1989, p. 249). Most rely on, and are guided by: theory; a search for the relationship between social/structural forces (especially class, race and gender) and human agency; and an open reflection on their own biases (e.g. Anderson, 1989; Roman & Apple, 1990; Lather, 1986; McLaren, 1989). Their theoretical and empirical writings include much of the vocabulary of critical theory (e.g. critical, dialectic/dialogue, domination, emancipation, empowerment, marginalization, powerlessness, resistance, student voice, transformation). Critical *research* is often described by researchers as designed to: be empowering; change participants' level of awareness; have an arousal effect; change the relationship between the researcher and other participants; and politically influence and inform educational action (Anderson, 1989; Apple, 1988; Giroux, 1988; Lather, 1986; McLaren, 1989; Paulston, 1991). These perspectives are summed up by Gary Anderson (1989) who observes that critical ethnographers "study society with the goal of transforming it and freeing individuals from sources of domination and repression" (p. 253).

In the United States, research studies often cited as representative of critical ethnography include those by Jean Anyon (1980) who focused on differences among students from different social class backgrounds in five separate schools (1980); Robert Everhart (1983) who focused on Reading, Writing and Resistance in urban junior high schools; and Lois Weis

(1985) who examined the experiences of Black students in an urban community college. The research of Michele Fine (1985), Jay MacLeod (1987), Linda Valli (1986), and some of Tierney's work (1992, 1993a, 1993b) provides other examples in a critical ethnographic genre. It is interesting to note that nearly all critical ethnography has been done in urban settings.

Although many critical ethnographers work within a sociological framework, the only education journal published by the American Sociological Association, Sociology of Education, focuses primarily on reporting quantitative research studies. The eight-year old International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education appears now to be providing an important publication place for those education researchers working within a critical ethnographic perspective. Patricia Adler and Peter Adler observed that, when Urban Life and Culture was first founded in 1971, it was the only sociological outlet designated exclusively for qualitative work. Now, however, there are at least five such outlets: Journal of Contemporary Education, Symbolic Interaction, Qualitative Sociology, Human Studies, and Humanity and Society, but only one is specifically directed toward education (1987, p.15).

In this very abbreviated and oversimplified review, I have examined some of the ways in which academics within a sociological tradition responded to the educational questions highlighted and generated during the 1960s as they looked for ways to make schools more equitable for an increasingly heterogeneous student population, and as they examined issues of power and control and the new role of the federal government in education. In addition to turning to sociology for explanations and recommendations, educators who were looking for answers outside the quantitative paradigm, like myself and several colleagues in Alaska, also looked to the discipline of anthropology.

Cultural Anthropology Ethnography

In the Dictionary of Anthropology (1970), Charles Winick's description of cultural anthropology includes the observation that it "is sometimes used interchangeably in America for what in England is called social anthropology, reflecting the traditional British interest in social systems and the major interest in culture of American anthropologists" (p. 29). This observation captures what is perhaps the most central and organizing aspect of cultural anthropology, and of *cultural anthropology ethnography*. The centrality of culture in understanding, describing, and interpreting phenomena is what distinguishes *cultural anthropology ethnography* from other genres of ethnographic research.

> In *its discipline of origin* [anthropology] the underlying rationale for doing ethnography is understood to be cultural interpretation. To commit to ethnography traditionally has meant to commit to looking at, and attempting to make sense of, human social behavior in terms of cultural patterning (Wolcott, 1990, p. 48).

In The White Man's Indian (1978), Robert Berkhofer's review of anthropology in helping to shape "Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present" provides a useful perspective on the development of anthropology, especially in relation to minority peoples. He examines the work and influence of Franz Boas in the early 20th century, as founder of the first comprehensive graduate program in anthropology at Columbia University, and as co-worker and teacher of many future cultural anthropologists. He states that Boas was "instrumental in developing new conceptions about human diversity . . . [and that] other professional anthropologists in the United States followed Boas and his students in repudiating raciology and evolutionism, and espousing the idea of culture as the way of understanding human diversity in lifestyles and as the foundation concept of their discipline" (p. 62). As part of his historical review, Berkhofer examines changing concepts of culture in the United States and says that, even though the concept of culture in a modern anthropological sense did not prevail in the social sciences in the United States until the 1930s at the earliest, "the basic presuppositions of cultural pluralism and relativism as established by Boas and his followers remain as fundamental to the new developments as they were to the American or historical school" (p. 65). By the 1950s British social anthropology had come to the United States with challenges to the Boasian school, but "although these new developments in anthropology provided new ways of understanding Native American lifestyles . . . they did not repudiate the basic moral and intellectual assumption of the idea of culture itself: the pluralism and relativism of moral non-judgment on and non-hierarchical ranking of social groups" (Berkhofer, 1978, p. 66).

Cultural anthropologists have continued to modify their theoretical orientations in the past twenty years just as they did during their first one hundred years of history. The concept of culture(s), relativism and cultural pluralism have continued to maintain a central position, and like other social scientists, anthropologists have become more introspective and reflective about their theories, methodologies, goals, and their own role in the research and writing process. Like sociologists, several have been influenced by the work of the European social scientists, the interpretive perspective (especially the work of Geertz) and critical theory.

Cultural anthropologists have used the long-established method of ethnography as their primary approach for learning about other people and other cultures. In the past, the rite of passage for anthropologists was to do ethnography by working with people in some "other place," but in the past 20 years anthropologists have increasingly used their ethnographic perspectives and "tools" to work within the United States (Messerschmidt, 1981). Many anthropological studies do continue to be with people from minority groups, thus providing the rationale for the continued use of the term cross-cultural. Today, ethnography continues as the primary tool of the cultural anthropologist, and it is the term used to describe both the *process* of research, and the written *product* .

I reviewed the work and analytical writings of several people who have used ethnography in a cultural anthropology tradition, and in the process discovered wide variation in both methodology (process) and in the manner of reporting the research (product). However, in all of the work there is a strong consensus about what I refer to as an *ethnographic approach.* Despite the differences in terminology it is evident that the group of researchers who practice in this tradition share a set of beliefs about what is integral to a cultural anthropology ethnographic approach. These include: (1) the importance of respect for participants *and* for their world views, (2) the value of exploratory or discovery-oriented research using an inductive approach in a natural setting, and (3) the necessity of a holistic perspective interpreted through cultural constructs.

In the "Introduction" to Qualitative Inquiry in Education, Elliot Eisner and Alan Peshkin (1990) review the link between cultural anthropology ethnography and education that developed in the late 1960s.

> Where ethnography and education are joined, we find the longest, most secure attachment to qualitative research, for ethnographers have long been comfortable with the efficacy of their nonquantitative means of inquiry. The fruits of their labor are manifest in the approximately twenty-year old Council on Anthropology and Education and its equally old publication, once a newsletter and now an established periodical, called Anthropology and Education Quarterly. The marriage of anthropology and education, among the most robust of the links between education and a social science discipline, is further apparent in the Holt, Rinehart and Winston Case Studies in Education and Culture series that George and Louise Spindler have edited since 1967 and that Waveland Press has continued to keep in print (p. 5-6).

The Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE) was established as a sub-section of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in 1968. It "is a professional association of anthropologists and educational researchers concerned with the application of anthropology to research and development in education" (from the official policy statement of the Anthropology and Education Quarterly). It is an organization that includes 11 working committees in its structure. These committees organize on the basis of specific interests and issues, and the groups' foci range from "Cognition, Language and Literacy" to "Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation in Education" to "Women in Schools and Society." People who participate in the Council on Anthropology and Education, and who contribute to its journal include not only those formally trained in anthropology, but a growing number from other disciplines who are interested in, and have been influenced by, anthropology. The common bond of the diverse group of people in the anthropology and education community is the belief that the theory *and* methodology of cultural anthropology can contribute to understanding and solving educational problems.

In the larger community of professional educators, the work that is most familiar and most often referred to as cultural anthropology ethnography is the work of people in the anthropology and education tradition whose work is broad-based, and sometimes described as macroethnography (Wolcott, 1990). It includes the kinds of ethnographies found in the Spindler series, Case Studies of Education and Culture with studies ranging from the Canadian and Alaskan North to Africa, and from urban schools to Gypsy communities in the United States. Also included under this classification are the case studies in Sol Kimball's Anthropology and Education series that range from urban settings to Third World countries, as well as edited books such as Functions of Language in the Classroom, and the ethnographic case study series edited by Ray Rist. Examples of work done in this macro cultural anthropology ethnographic tradition include that of Elizabeth Eddy (1969), John Hostetler & Gertrude Huntington (1971), Alan Peshkin (1978, 1982), Ray Rist (1973), Louise Spindler & George Spindler (1971), and Harry Wolcott (1973). The contributions of two other cultural anthropology ethnographers, Hugh Mehan (1979, 1984, 1992) and John Ogbu (1974, 1978, 1987, 1992), are noteworthy because their work is published, and claimed, in both anthropology and sociology. Whereas most critical ethnography has thus far occurred in large urban areas in the United States or in Britain, cultural anthropology ethnographic research appears to be about evenly divided between rural and urban areas in the United States and elsewhere, including Third World countries.

Two research projects that provide examples of how an ethnographic approach has been used successfully to document and examine the experiences of students in university settings are Michael Moffatt's Coming of Age in New Jersey: College and American Culture (1989) and Dorothy Holland and Margaret Eisenhart's Educated in Romance: Women, Achievement and College Culture (1991). They both illustrate the depth and breadth of description and analysis that is afforded through the use of ethnography for research in university settings. Current work by Hugh Mehan with minority high school and beginning college students in the San Diego area will serve as another useful resource. William Tierney's research with Native American university students (1991, 1992, 1993b) provides an interesting melding of the perspectives of critical theory and cultural anthropology perspectives.

A subgroup in anthropology and education that has made a significant contribution to studying inequality in schools is the group of researchers that has used the cultural anthropology ethnographic perspective to study language. (It is interesting to note that this represents a logical merger between two of the four main subfields in the discipline of anthropology: archaeology, *cultural anthropology*, *linguistics* and physical anthropology.) This group's work, done primarily in the past 20 years and much of it with people for whom English is a first language, has come to be known as *sociolinguistics* and, sometimes, as the *ethnography of communication*. Some of the participants in this group work within a formal linguistic and sociolinguistic framework, while others work within a broader, and less technical, communication framework as they focus on language use (rather than, or in addition to, language structure) within the school environment (e.g. Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Gilmore & Glatthorn, 1982; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1979). Sometimes this type of research is described as microethnographic.

As described earlier, anthropologists have had a longtime relationship with Native Americans and that tradition continues today. Nearly all ethnographic educational research with Native Americans has been done by people in the cultural anthropology ethnographic community, and much of it has been reported in the Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Some of the people who have used cultural anthropology to shape their studies of education with Native Americans include the following: John Collier (1973, 1988), Malcolm Collier, (1986), Donna Dehyle (1989), Robert Dumont, (1972), Fred Erickson and Gerald Mohatt, (1982), Vera John, (1972), Wendy Kasten, (1992), Dan McLaughlin, (1989), Barry Osborne (1989), Susan Philips (1982), Ron Scollon and Suzanne Scollon (1979), George Spindler and Louise Spindler (1971), William Tierney (1992), Murray Wax (1964), and Harry Wolcott (1967). Some who have worked within this tradition with Alaska Native people include Carol Barnhardt (1981, 1982), Ray Barnhardt (1977, 1991a, 1991b), Patrick Dubbs (1982, 1992), Perry Gilmore and David Smith (1989), Barbara Harrison (1982), Oscar Kawagley (1990, 1993), Jerry Lipka (1990, 1991, 1994), Eric Madsen (1990) and Ron Scollon (1981). Their work has helped to identify some of the cultural dissonance that occurs between the beliefs and practices of Native Americans and those espoused by the American educational system.

Other Qualitative Approaches

In the field of education there are of course other important qualitative educational research approaches and methods, in addition to *critical ethnography* and *cultural anthropology ethnography*. The contributions of three groups in particular are important and should be included in any broad review of qualitative research in education. The first includes people who focus on the use of ethnography in evaluation, including Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba (1985, 1989), and David Fetterman (1988). The second group are people whose eclectic contributions to qualitative educational research defy easy categorizing. This includes people like Elliot Eisner (1991) and Maxine Greene (1988) who work within a discipline but whose contributions to the qualitative debate extend far beyond their own academic community. A third group includes university educators, practicing teachers, and other practitioners who do not necessarily affiliate professionally with one of the social science disciplines, but whose research practice and writing falls within a qualitative framework. While such people often do not devote a major portion of their time to *formal* academic research, they do apply their qualitative orientation to developing programs or to writing and distributing publications that are qualitative in nature such as those by Samuel Freedman, (1990); Garret Keizer, (1988), Herbert Kohl (1990), Sara Lightfoot (1983), Mike Rose (1989), and Theodore Sizer (1984, 1990, 1992).

Some of the most interesting reflections on inquiry in qualitative educational research today can be found in Eisner and Peshkin's edited book, Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate (1990). The assemblage of contributors from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds and perspectives, the actual format of the book (with presentations, responses and opportunities for real dialogue) *and* its content allow it to serve as a summary of the current status of the qualitative debate. Eisner and Peshkin, two of the most experienced and knowledgeable members of the qualitative research community, treat their readers as thinking, capable, sense-making individuals who can make choices if they are presented with a wide range of options for theory and practice in a non-prescriptive manner. Their metaphorical reference to the "quiet revolution in which a coalition government emerges" provides an indication of where Eisner and Peshkin think the qualitative debate is headed (p. 13). Their very candid observation about the book's contents provides one of the most accurate and honest assessment of the state of the art, and the place of the arguments, for the qualitative educational debate of the 1990s: "Here's some good stuff, but as we get wiser and better at what we do, our stuff will improve" (p. 17).

Methodology

After reviewing and learning more about the variety of ethnographic traditions, I returned to my research question *"What factors contribute to the academic success of Alaska Native teacher education students at UAF?"* and determined that an ethnographic approach, drawing most directly from the cultural anthropology tradition, was the most appropriate for my purposes. This approach provided me with a framework for studying a complex and dynamic social system; allowed me to conduct my research over an extended period of time; encouraged me to respect the perspectives of all participants; and "insisted" that culture be an integral component of my interpretation and analysis. In addition, there appeared to be a natural fit between the research question, my own professional educational experiences and the particular Alaskan context in which I was working.

In this section, I describe the methodological components of my study, and following that, I examine more thoroughly why cultural anthropology ethnography was the most appropriate "community" in which to ground my research.

Site and Sample

In Designing Qualitative Research, Marshall and Rossman (1989) describe the ideal research site as a place in which

> (1) entry is possible; (2) there is a high probability that a rich mix of many of the processes, people, programs, interactions, and/or structures that may be a part of the research question will be present; (3) the researcher can devise an appropriate role to maintain continuity of presence for as long as necessary; and (4) data quality and credibility of the study are reasonably assured by avoiding poor sampling decisions. (p. 54)

I was fortunate to have such a site. Entry was possible and I had the support of students expressed formally, through a letter from support from the Alaska Native Education Student Association (ANESA), and informally through the positive response to requests for interviews, and I had endorsement and support from people in various positions within the UAF community. My multiple roles as an instructor, advisor and member of several committees guaranteed that my professional (and personal) life was "a rich mix of many of the processes, people, programs, interactions, and/or structures that were part of the research question" that Catherine Marshall and Gretchen Rossman (1989) describe (p. 54).

I included in my study *all* undergraduate Alaska Native students who met the following criteria: (1) graduated between May of 1989 and May of 1993; (2) completed all requirements for an elementary or secondary Alaska teaching certificate by completing either a B. Ed. program or an education certification minor; and (3) completed the majority of their coursework on the Fairbanks campus of UAF (as distinguished from the UAF field-based teacher education program, "X-CED," which serves approximately 100 students in rural areas of Alaska). Fifty students met these criteria. By including all of the students who had graduated since May of 1989 my sample was large enough to ensure broad representation of Alaska Native students who completed the teacher education program in Fairbanks. Alaska Native students represent about 15 to 20 percent of the total number of teacher education students at UAF. Students were identified as Alaska Native or American Indian through university records and personal knowledge.

Researcher as Participant and Observer

My role as a participant and observer in the study was facilitated by the instructor's position I held at UAF and by my past involvement in a wide variety of educational settings in both rural and urban Alaskan settings. My relationship with students and other participants in the university provided me with the opportunity to do this research, and my research topic, questions and design have been shaped and informed by these experiences and relationships.

During the time of the study, I was in the position of being both an insider and an outsider, a participant and an observer with different groups associated with the project, and in some instances the boundaries between roles were quite fluid. Although I was an insider in some aspects of the university system, because I was a non-tenure track, term-funded instructor, I was an outsider in other circumstances (e.g. education faculty meetings where only tenure-track faculty are allowed to participate, grant policies that are restricted to full-time/tenure-track faculty, participation in university-wide governing bodies). I am an outsider in the Alaska Native community because I am not an Alaska Native. However, because of the responsibilities associated with some of the roles in which I have served, I have been privy to insiders' perspectives, and in some instances I have been viewed as an insider because of my advocacy role on behalf of Native students within the University system. During the period of time in which I did my fieldwork and analysis, I had no evaluative responsibilities in relation to the students directly involved in the study.

Time Line

I formally initiated this research after I presented and successfully defended my proposal before my doctoral committee at the University of British Columbia in the fall of 1991, and after I had received formal approval for my research from the University of British Columbia Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee For Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects in the Spring of 1992. Informally, however, I had imagined a study somewhat like this on many occasions since I had begun teaching courses on the Fairbanks campus of UAF.

During 1992 I gathered information on Alaska Native programs and services at UAF, completed research on and prepared a history of schooling for Alaska Native people, and began interviewing students. In 1993, I prepared a summary report that included information on all of UAF's Alaska Native programs, student services and courses. I also completed the student interviews, prepared the transcriptions, entered information from student records into a data base, and began the formal analysis and writing. In 1994, I wrote, circulated drafts of individual chapters to a variety of people within the UAF community—and rewrote. I presented reports on this study at four conferences and incorporated feedback that I received from those presentations.

Data Collection Techniques

Due to the complexity of my research question I used a variety of sources and approaches for gathering data about three different contexts: (1) the Alaska Native educational context, which I studied primarily through written sources (Chapter 4); (2) the UAF institutional context, which I examined primarily from information available in public documents and reports (Chapter 5); and (3) the student context which I learned about by gathering data from students' university records, through individual student interviews, and through participant observation (Chapters 6 and 7). The use and integration of these varied sources and approaches provided a means for contextualizing the issues to which the study is addressed.

1. Historical Work

The first component of my research design was the preparation of a brief historical account of schooling for Alaska Native people. This account places Alaska Native education in the wider framework of federal Native American policies, and includes contemporary social, political and economic information that is critical for understanding and interpreting some of the unique circumstances of the Alaska context. I drew primarily on secondary sources for my historical research on federal policies related to Native American educational policies and programs, and I used primary sources, including those from my own previous historical research study (C. Barnhardt, 1985), to gather information on the history of Alaska

Native education. Chapter 4 provides the necessary context for interpreting data about UAF and about students' experiences.

2. Document Analysis

I collected, reviewed and analyzed a wide variety of public documents that described policies, programs, students services and courses at UAF—in particular those that were designed in response to the perceived interests and needs of Alaska Native and rural students. These include UAF responses to the increasing number of Alaska Native and rural students on the Fairbanks campus, as well as responses to the general needs of Alaska Native people and others in rural communities.

Since my intention in gathering information on these programs was *descriptive* rather than *evaluative*, I relied upon official university publications when available (especially the University of Alaska and University of Alaska Fairbanks "fact books," undergraduate catalogs, and department or program brochures), as well as articles from the Fairbanks and UAF newspapers, and occasionally, internal reports. When necessary, I sought guidance from the handful of people whose past experience constituted the "institutional memory," and thus could provide clarification or information about the best route to pursue to compile the historical facts on certain programs where current information was not readily available. Gathering even the most basic data was one of the more challenging aspects of the research because of the lack of official records in this area.

From these documents I prepared a summary report which includes a narrative description of the 27 Alaska Native programs I identified, including information on each of the following variables: year initiated, administrative unit, people eligible to participate, approximate percentage of Alaska Native/Native American participants, and original and primary source of funding. This report, *Alaska Native Programs and Students Services On Campus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks,* (which serves as the source of information for several tables included in Chapter 5, and is included as Appendix A) pulls together in one place, for the first time, information on all of the various programs, student services, and courses that address Alaska Native people and issues on the Fairbanks Campus of UAF. I also prepared a list of all of the regularly-offered undergraduate academic courses that had "Alaska Native" and/or "rural" in the course title or description in the UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94. This is included as Appendix B.

3. Student University Records

Since the Education Department at UAF does not have a data base with information on students in its undergraduate teacher education program, I gathered information from original sources (student files) rather than relying on the statistics presented in official university publications such as the annually published UAF Fact Book or the University of Alaska Statewide Statistical Abstract. Although these reports are useful for establishing trends and generating researchable questions, the information related to race and ethnicity in these publications is frequently misleading and/or inaccurate because of the ambiguity in the categories that students are asked to select from when they identify themselves for university, state or federal purposes. For instance, on one UAF form, Yup'ik Eskimo students have the option of identifying themselves as E=Alaska Eskimo *or* N=Alaska Native Unspecified *or* O=Other *or* Y=Alaska Eskimo Yup'ik, and Athabaskan students can choose from I=Alaska Indian *or* N=Alaskan Native Unspecified *or* O=Other *or* T=Alaskan Indian Athabaskan. If I had relied upon official records for identifying students who are Alaska Native, it would not have been possible to compile an accurate listing because of the vagueness of the choices or because students chose not to complete this optional section of the form.

I used student's academic transcripts to gather data on such variables as age, high school attended, semesters at UAF, GPA, test scores, major, etc. I used information from other forms in student's files for information on other variables such as previous work experiences, availability of transportation, location of student teaching, etc. For each of the 50 students I entered information into a database (Panorama II) on 84 variables, and since I entered it all myself the chances for inconsistency were minimized (Appendix C). This data base serves as a major part of the research findings. It supplements and corroborates descriptive data from the interviews and the program descriptions, and it serves as an important tool for the analysis in Chapters 6 and 7. It also provides a quantitative dimension to the qualitative information generated from the interviews and from my participant/observer role.

4. Ethnographic Interviews

The use of interviewing as a research tool is described in nearly every description of any type of ethnographic *process*, and data from interviews is included in almost all ethnographic *products*. The ethnographic interviews were one of the most central and important methodological tools in my research because they served as the primary means for obtaining students' perspectives.

Descriptions in the research literature of general ethnographic interviews contain several common themes. In their textbook description, McMillan and Schumacher (1989) state that "Ethnographic interviews, which use open-response questions to obtain data of *participant meanings*, may be the primary data collection strategy or a natural outgrowth of observation strategies. *Participant meanings* refer to how individuals in social scenes conceive of their world and how they explain or 'make sense' of the important events in their lives" (p. 405). Marshall and Rossman (1989) discuss the value of the ethnographic interview as coming from "its focus on the culture through a native perspective and through a firsthand encounter. . . it provides for flexibility in the formulation of hypotheses and avoids oversimplification in description and analysis because of the rich descriptions" (p. 93). Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) expand on these themes in a larger context, and provide more detail about the questioning process itself.

> The main difference between the way in which ethnographers and survey interviewers ask questions is not, as is sometimes suggested, that one form of interviewing is "structured" and the other is "unstructured." All interviews, like any other kinds of social interaction, are structured by both researcher and informant. The important distinction to be made is between standardized and reflexive interviewing. Ethnographers do not decide beforehand the questions they want to ask, though they may enter the interview with a list of issues to be covered. Nor do they restrict themselves to a single mode of questioning. On different occasions, or at different points in the same interview, the approach may be non-directive or directive, depending on the function that the questioning is intended to serve. (p. 112)

My role and purpose in interviewing followed the guidelines described above. I developed a list of general themes for the interviews (Appendix D), and from this developed a list of questions for each student that was appropriate and applicable for each individual. I used the list as a guide, rather than as a checklist, and also as a place to jot down questions that were generated by student's responses. My policy and practice were very much like what McMillan and Schumacher (1989) describe as "the interview guide approach" in which "topics are selected in advance but the researcher decides the sequence and working of the questions during the interview . . . it is relatively conversational and situational" (p. 405).

My intention was to interview about half of the students in the group because I felt this would provide a good representation, and the transcription process would not be too overwhelming. I was correct on the first part of my assumption and wrong on the second! I wrote to all of the students and asked if they were interested in being interviewed, knowing that it would not be possible for many of them due to scheduling problems, distance from Fairbanks, etc. I interviewed 20 students (from the group of 50) who were representative of the entire group considering variables of age, gender, culture, home region and family status. In addition, I interviewed four students who would have been part of the group had they not voluntarily chosen to delay their graduation time (and whose records were therefore not included in the data base).

Time spent meeting with each student for the interview process was approximately one and a half hours. During the first 15 minutes we usually visited and caught up on events in each other's lives. During the next 15 minutes we usually talked about the necessity for, and the options available on, the UBC consent forms in which students made their choices about confidentiality, future use of the tape-recordings and transcripts, freedom to shut the tape-recorder off at any time, options to review the transcript of their interview, etc. Five students asked to have the interview transcript returned to them so that they could review what they said—none of them chose to make any modifications.

Each of the interviews was tape-recorded, and the majority were about an hour in length. Students chose the location where the interview would take place, and they occurred in dorm rooms, work places, homes, restaurants, my university office, the university student center and one in a hotel where a statewide conference was being held. When the weather was nice, we often had the interview outside on the university lawn. I always brought snack food and beverages or purchased a meal for the student if we met in a place where that was an option. Following the interviews, I made quick notes to myself about things that I particularly wanted to remember. In order to assure confidentiality, I did the transcribing of the interviews myself.

5. Participant/Observation and Analytic Journal

As described in the section on the role of the researcher, my role varied somewhat from the more traditional role of a participant/observer. I was "on the scene" during the three years I did the formal research and writing as an instructor in the teacher education program, but I was not directly involved in the academic activities of the students who participated in the study. I consciously attempted to follow some advice offered by George Spindler (1982) in his "Criteria For a Good Ethnography of Schooling"—that "inquiry and observation must disturb as little as possible the process of interaction and communication in the setting being studied" (p. 7).

I documented and reflected on the research process, and on my role in that process, from the time that I was accepted into the Ph.D. program at UBC in the spring of 1990 until the end of the writing process in the summer of 1994. I used a format that Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) describe as "analytic notes."

> Equally important is regular review and development of analytic ideas in the form of analytic memos. [These are] written notes whereby progress is assessed, emergent ideas are identified, research strategy is sketched out.
>
> This process of progressive focusing means that the collection of data must be guided by the unfolding but explicit identification of topics for inquiry. . . . It is a reflexive monitoring of the research process.

> The construction of such notes therefore constitutes precisely that sort of internal dialogue, or thinking aloud, that is the essence of reflexive ethnography . . . one is forced to question what one knows, *how* such knowledge has been acquired, the *degree of certainty* of such knowledge and what further lines of inquiry are implied. (pp. 164-165)

"Progressive focusing" *was* important, and one of the essential components in this focusing process was the feedback I received on a regular basis—from my committee—and from a variety of people within the UAF setting.

Before I began my study, I had circulated a draft of a shortened version of my proposal among several UAF students, faculty and student services personnel. From them I received several suggestions and statements of support for the direction of the study. Later in the process, I gave drafts of the chapters on the history of schooling and the UAF context to people who were especially knowledgeable in these areas. I asked them to provide me with feedback—particularly on the accuracy of my information and on whether or not they felt I had provided sufficient data to warrant my conclusions. I also gave drafts of the two student chapters to some of the students I had interviewed, as well as other individuals who had worked with many of the students involved. I asked them to comment on the same areas, and to be attuned to whether or not I might have included comments that would have allowed an individual student to be identified. The comments from these individuals were an important part of the research process for me. They caused me to pay attention to the kinds of questions and issues raised by individuals who were also "on the scene," and they helped me to keep in mind that my descriptions and explanations needed to make sense to audiences who were both *here* (at UAF) and *there* (everywhere else).

My informal analytic (computer) journal did serve the purpose Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) suggest. It allowed me to continually review and reflect upon the development of my research design and it aided in the identification of themes and patterns. Data collection and data analysis went hand-in-hand.

Guiding Considerations

There are clearly many similarities as well as differences between the theories, methodologies and goals of people who work within critical ethnography and cultural anthropology ethnography. Attempts to develop typologies or identify distinctions between disciplines, subdisciplines or certain traditions is a heuristic exercise that, if carried to extreme, can place us right back in a positivistic, objective model. Boundaries are obviously crossed and genres blurred by real people who practice social science, so at some stages of research these distinctions can seem superfluous.

Critical ethnography and cultural anthropology ethnography have more in common than those general considerations that identify the work of all qualitative researchers. Members of both groups are bringing their social science perspectives to bear on education in an attempt to address the problems that are inherent in a compulsory system of public schooling. Sociologists and anthropologists who are using the perspectives of their respective disciplines for research within the field of education are influenced by many of the same academic and intellectual movements. Ethnographers from both traditions are engaged in research and teaching that will inform and hopefully enrich our understanding of how public schooling can provide equal opportunities and comparable outcomes, where one group of students will not be privileged over another. There are some important differences, however, between the two traditions in their history and emergent orientation—some very obvious and some more subtle. In order to guide my research process, I considered some of the implications of these differences—particularly as they related to the role of theory, sociolinguistic contributions, bases for interpretation, and impact considerations.

The Role of Theory

During my exploratory work on critical ethnography and cultural anthropology ethnography, I found that I was able to locate more theoretical and analytical writings *about* critical ethnography than actual ethnographic studies, whereas the opposite was true for cultural anthropology ethnography. For those working within the critical ethnography community, theory appears to play a more central and directing role than it does for those working in cultural anthropology ethnography, where it tends to be an emergent property .

Mary Metz served as guest editor for a special ethnographic issue of Sociology of Education in 1984. In that role she was required to work with writers and reviewers from both anthropology and sociology, so she was in the advantageous position of being able to listen and learn from people in both disciplines, and to think about the two in relationship to one another. Her observations speak directly to the issue of theory.

> As I worked with the papers submitted, I noticed that authors with an anthropological orientation were much more comfortable with the complexity of data and analysis than those with a sociological orientation. Anthropologically oriented authors gave rich accounts but sometimes needed to be encouraged to draw overall conclusions and to establish their relevance to other work. Sociologically oriented authors emphasized explanations and theoretical inferences but sometimes rushed through a schematic presentation of data. Editorial encouragement often elicited both richer accounts of data and more thoroughly grounded analyses. Perhaps we need to remember to honor the early sociologists who rooted our discipline in qualitative studies. Encouraging the rising generation of sociologists to do qualitative work and to accept its complexity and untidiness may reward us with fresh insight in the long term at the cost of clarity and certainty in the short term. (Metz, p. 199)

My own questions and concerns about theory have been generated not only on the basis of the role that theory plays before or after research, but on whether or not theory takes precedence over practice and whether theoretical language dominates the written account. Central to my research orientation has been the use of culture as a focal construct to address the unique perspectives and conditions of Native Americans, and Alaska Natives specifically. Since "culture" has a long history of both theoretical and practical application in several disciplines, it provided an analytical frame of reference that offered the latitude to incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives as outlined in Chapter 2. The disciplines, people and ideas who were most influential in shaping my conceptual perspective, and thus my research design and interpretation, included those associated with the study of comparative education, higher education and minority students; the history of Native American education, and anthropology and education.

I have come to recognize that it is important for me to work within a tradition where theory does not take precedence over practice and possibly limit the options for flexibility—especially so in an area like higher education where the variables have changed so significantly in the past twenty years. As Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) remind us "readers should understand that the evolving character of higher education's clientele, specifically the growing numbers of minority group and older students, *raises serious questions about the universal applicability of* [conventional] *theories and models*" [italics added] (p. 17). Consequently, the approach I have taken is intended to be more *explanation-derived* than *theory-driven.*

Sociolinguistics in Educational Research

I have found the work of sociolinguists who work within a cultural anthropology tradition essential in helping me understand and interpret what is going on in cross-cultural settings in the past, and there is no question that this knowledge played an important role in shaping the design and conduct of this study. I was especially aware of this as I listened to the audiotapes of the interviews and realized, because of its absence, how powerful and important the non-verbal communication was in providing meaning in the actual face-to-face sessions. I was also very aware that the conversational style in some of the interviews would be quite unfamiliar to some people because of cross-cultural differences in some of the Native students' communication patterns as contrasted with the general student population at UAF (e.g. the use of indirect comments and/or stories to respond to a question, longer pause times, distinct intonation and rhythm patterns).

An awareness of, familiarity with, and respect for cultural differences in interactional styles (gleaned from sociolinguistic research and/or immersion experiences) can be pivotal to the success of cross-cultural projects. Successful communication, especially in a research setting, can occur only in contexts where the participants have genuine respect for one another and for communication patterns different than their own, and where participants have ways to comfortably deal with, and work through, the miscommunications that inevitably occur in cross-cultural exchanges.

As I listened to the taped interviews I was reminded of other approaches to interviewing that do not take into account different communication styles. In particular, I remembered the interview training I had received several years ago when I was a member of an educational research team that was about to depart to several rural areas of Alaska to do fieldwork that involved a lot of interviewing. To prepare us for this, an outside academic "expert" was brought in to train us in the mechanics of interviewing. The interview process we were to use with parents, teachers and administrators was bound by very rigid and specific rules. This approach may have been appropriate in a culturally homogeneous context; however, the artificial and impersonal rules for interaction and their inappropriateness in a rural, cross-cultural context made the methodology not only very uncomfortable for both interviewee and interviewer, but it also made the data from the interviews quite problematic.

There does not appear to be a great deal of utilization of sociolinguistic research by critical ethnographers, and as Anderson (1989) observes "critical ethnographers in education, with few exceptions, seem to underestimate in their own work the potential of sociolinguistic analysis to systematically explore how relations of domination are sustained through the mobilization of meaning" (p. 263). Mehan (1992), too, argues for the inclusion of "ethnographically informed sociolinguistic research [because it offers] a model of mutual accommodation in which both teachers and students can modify their behavior in the direction of a common goal" (p. 7). It would be especially challenging to attempt to do research in a cross-cultural setting without having been either immersed in that community or setting for an extended period of time or without having the opportunity to benefit from the knowledge that is available in the cultural anthropology sociolinguistic literature. The ability of researchers and participants to recognize and resolve misinterpretations and miscommunications that develop because of cross-cultural differences can "make or break" a research project.

Focus of Research and Interpretation

The commitment of cultural anthropology ethnography is to cultural interpretation, in both the process and the product of ethnography, whereas the commitment of critical ethnography is to an interpretation based on the structures of social class, race and gender (which of course have cultural roots). Although many critical ethnographic studies make reference to *culture*, there does not appear to be a consensus about what culture is and where it fits into the interpretations. Identifications of cultures as "high and low, popular and elite, dominant and subordinate" suggest a hierarchical orientation that is different from a cultural anthropologist's interpretation of culture. The definition of culture provided by Dubbs (1982) as "the learned and shared knowledge, beliefs, values, and expressive modes that people have in their heads and which they use to interpret and interact with the world around them" (p. 14) is typical of a cultural anthropologist's understanding of culture.

In Alaska, and in other places where there are populations of Native Americans, an awareness and recognition of the centrality of culture in interpretation is essential to understanding what is going on. In a series of articles on the history and problems of American Indian education, Vine Deloria (a Sioux Indian and a political scientist) makes frequent reference to the importance of culture.

> The second most popular argument in Indian education is that Indians are really a different cultural set and therefore generate different kinds of problems. Cultural difference should have been reasonably clear in 1492 and by the early 1700s when formal educational efforts for Indians began someone should have started to think about what cultural difference meant. Certainly after almost three centuries people ought to be getting a grip on the nature of this cultural difference. But now, less than two years away from the 500th anniversary of European contact, it should not come as any surprise that Indians really do represent an entirely different set of cultural beliefs and practices even though many of the most profound differences have disappeared over the last century (1991, p.62).

The research tradition in which I work must provide an avenue for learning about and recognizing the nature of these cultural differences, and it must allow for the inclusion of cultural differences in the interpretation. This is not meant to imply that the factors of race, class and gender are not important, but they too must be considered *within* the larger cultural context. In Alaska, social class and workers' struggles do not have the same meaning as in large, industrial settings where neo-Marxist interpretations are likely to be far more central and appropriate. Likewise, many of the issues associated with gender in higher education are quite different for Alaska Native people than for non-Natives. While Alaska Native women are moving into professional and leadership roles in rapidly increasing numbers, Native men are experiencing a degree of cultural dislocation that is producing the highest rate of suicide in the nation. It is necessary to use caution when imposing frameworks for interpreting social class or gender differences in a context where broader cultural considerations play such a central role.

Interpretation of human behavior in a research framework where culture is not a central construct assumes a level of uniformity that is rarely, if ever, present in educational settings. It is always problematic to interpret the actions and belief systems of other people, but it is especially so in research environments that include participants from cultural systems as different as those in Alaska. In the next chapter, "History of Schooling for Alaska Native People," I provide contextual and cultural knowledge about Native American people, and about Alaska Native people specifically, as an aid to interpreting the information in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

First Principle—Do No Harm

For critical ethnographers, politics and power are central to the purpose of educational research (Giroux, 1988). Anderson's statement that critical ethnographers do research "to free individuals from sources of domination and repression" (1989, p. 249) provides an accurate summary of what is presented in most critical ethnographic texts. Although I am in complete agreement with the notion that research should contribute to "empowerment," and a decrease in domination and repression, I personally am uncomfortable about asserting that my research will directly help "to free individuals from sources of domination and repression." I am most concerned about such claims in cross-cultural research because of the dangers of imposing one's own norms and interpretations.

One of the limitations of formal academic research is that it is nearly always laden with and bound by restrictions related to funding, publication, advancement, and status within the academic community. While academic research can make a contribution to empowerment it needs to be coupled with other initiatives if it is to lead to responsive changes in oppressive social systems. One example researchers can consider is the model provided by Myles Horton at the Highlander Folk School in Appalachia where disenfranchised people have been inspired to act through the information and support provided in a safe environment. Horton insisted that problems be identified by the people themselves and his role was that of facilitator. He was successful in helping very divergent groups of people address their problems because he did not impose his own agenda, but rather provided a place for critical dialogue and guidance for community-based participatory research (Adams, 1980; Horton, 1990; Social Policy, 1991).

One of the more frequently discussed options today for blurring the distinction between researchers and "those researched," and between theory and practice, is collaborative research because it does offer *the possibility* of a more balanced and democratically produced research process and product. Anderson (1989) describes collaboration as an approach that many critical ethnographers choose as a way to operationalize empowerment. However, collaboration has the same potential pitfalls as other forms of research if one is not alert to cross-cultural differences.

In four out of the six Alaska Native cross-cultural education research projects in which I have participated, the modus operandi has been "collaborative." Each of these collaborative experiences was productive, rewarding—and always challenging because of the complexity of cross-cultural interactions. I have become appreciative of the very real potential for misunderstanding, miscommunication, and abuse of power that can exist in cross-cultural research situations in institutional settings, especially where the final responsibility to make decisions on what is written and what is made public falls on one person, usually the principal-investigator. Joseph Tobin and Dana Davidson's (1990) very frank analysis of their own problems in collaborative, i.e. "polyvocal," cross-cultural research illustrates why ethnographers need to be cautious about generating unrealistic expectations of both researchers and participants while participating in, and producing, what they believe will result in *genuinely collaborative* efforts when research and writing is involved. They conclude that, in many instances, collaborative ethnographic research is both an illusion and a reality of "shared interpretive authority between researcher and informant." Although it holds the potential for "letting researchers and informants interact on a more equal footing and of letting informants' voices come through in the final text," the authors have also come to realize that "in our enthusiasm and naiveté, we failed to prepare informants for the feelings of being textualized and contextualized that we now believe to be inevitable in polyvocal research. We also are concerned that the promise of polyvocality may encourage informants to reveal more than they ordinarily might do to more obviously authoritarian researchers" (p. 279). Tobin and Davidson concluded:

> In qualitative research that emphasizes reflexivity, consent and confidentiality are only the beginnings of ethical issues to be addressed. A fundamental ethical precept of research is "to do no harm.". . . In a cross-cultural study such as ours, this question [i.e. were participants harmed by the research process] is very hard to answer. We must consider which culture's ethical standards and child socialization practices should serve as our ethical touchstones. (p. 275)

My intention, in this research project, was to conduct a study that would have maximum benefit for individuals and institutions, and it did not lend itself to the level of collaboration that might be appropriate for responding to other types of research questions and other goals.

My primary role, both within the institution, and in this research study, has been that of a liaison and broker. I have tried to translate the culture of the university (e.g. its traditions, priorities and practices) to Native students, while at the same time attempting to translate what I have learned from experiences of UAF Alaska Native students to others within the university community.

I am very aware of many instances when Alaska Native people have been betrayed because of the abuse or misuse of "findings" obtained in the guise of academic research, and I do know UAF students and graduates who have been victimized by unethical research practices. During this research project, I have made every effort to be as up-front and honest as possible with members of the Alaska Native community at UAF about what I was doing and why. The UBC ethical consent forms served as a good tool for initiating discussion about the uses and the limitations of academic research (particularly since there were no comparable requirements at UAF during the time I was doing my research). In an interesting observation, one of the Native students said that she saw my non-Native status as an advantage because in my quasi-outsider position I was a "safe" person to talk with.

All of the results in this study have obviously been filtered through the perspective of a non-Native person—myself as the "researcher." That's neither bad, nor good. What is critical is that I not misrepresent this research as something other than what it is. The analysis presented here represents my interpretation from my perspective as a liaison who is working within the system. I have asked students to share their perspectives with me and have made every attempt to present their views and their voices as accurately as possible. However, readers must not forget that my decisions about what to emphasize and include from the extensive data I gathered represents a judgment call on my part. To augment the information from the interviews, I have packed a great deal of data from the students' university records into the description and analysis. The information on the programs and services that UAF has developed for Alaska Native students, the data included in the database and summary statements about on-campus UAF Alaska Native students and their experiences, together with the historical information, provides readers with a solid foundation with which to make their own interpretations and offer alternative analyses of both UAF's response and students' experiences.

With the exception of the interviews, which nearly all students described as a satisfying process that allowed them to reflect on their college experiences in a way they had not done previously, the impact of this study on these and future students' lives will most likely be indirect and will come more from the product than the process. Policy and program decisions that are made on the basis of hearsay, hunches, emotion or stereotypes—by students or by university personnel—are not likely to lead to meaningful long-term change. Hopefully, the information assembled here will serve as impetus for a broad-based dialogue and provide a framework for generating future discussions about policy and practice. Accurate information is still one of the most potent tools for improvement—and empowerment.

If we are really interested in understanding more about the experiences of minority students in higher education, we need to foster research in a wide variety of contexts and from people with different histories and perspectives. We do need more research that comes just from Native people, and we do need to provide research opportunities in our institutions where people from different cultural groups have the freedom and the flexibility to do *genuinely* collaborative work. We need to expand our definition of polyvocal research by supporting not only collaborative research in which people with multiple voices work with one another, but we also need to encourage comparative and contrastive research that allows for a much broader range of methodologies.

CHAPTER 4

HISTORY OF SCHOOLING FOR ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLE

In this chapter I describe some of the historical circumstances that have helped to shape the educational experiences of Alaska Native students who come to study at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Through a brief review of the conditions of schooling for students in this study (and for their parents and grandparents), I examine how the legacy of these students was partially defined by the school experiences they had because they were Alaskans, *and* Native Americans, *and* Alaska Natives.

As was stated in Chapter 1, understanding the historical context of Native American/Alaska Native schooling is important in examining the experiences of Alaska Native students at UAF for the following reasons: (1) despite the unique legal standing recognizing the aboriginal rights of Native people and the federal government's binding treaty obligations to Native Americans (which have been extended in large part to Alaska Natives), many misunderstandings continue about the status and rights of Alaska Natives with regard to public education, health, social and economic services; (2) the history of Alaska Native education is *not* the same as the history of Native American education, and the differences are significant; (3) student's prior schooling experiences influence their performance in a university setting, and the schooling experiences of most Alaska Native students at UAF are significantly different from those of most students in any other state.

An additional reason for including this historical information is the scarcity of published information on the history of education in Alaska. The most recent treatment of the subject was an article in the Polar Record in 1979 (Darnell). Even though Alaska ranks as the state with the fifth largest Native American population, most books written about Native American education focus only on Indians in the Lower 48 states. Some authors do give Alaska Natives a cursory nod, as Margaret Szasz (1974) does when she prefaces her historical account of Indian education by saying that "Alaskan Native children are mentioned only briefly; their school conditions are unique and should be the subject of a separate study" (vii). Others attempt to explain away the Alaska oversight in their analyses, as Francis Prucha (1984) does when he states that:

> Alaska Natives—Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts—offered unique problems [for the federal government], for they had never been fully encompassed in the federal policies and programs developed for the American Indians. Alaska for decades seemed remote and out of the way; no treaties were made with the natives there, few reservations were established for them, and only small appropriations were made for their benefit. Not until the mid-twentieth century did striking changes occur that demanded attention to the claims of the aboriginal peoples of Alaska. (p. 1128)

In this chapter, therefore, I present a brief historical account of Native American and Alaska Native educational policies and practices, embedded in a description of the broader, and in some instances unique, socio-political environment. I have done this to provide the necessary context for understanding the development of Alaska Native policies, programs and services at UAF as described in Chapter 5; and the experiences of the 50 Alaska Native students in this study as presented in Chapters 6 and 7. The chapter is organized around: (1) an overview of the Alaskan context; (2) a review of federal policies that have directly affected schooling for Alaska Native people; and (3) a brief history of schooling for Alaska Native people, with an emphasis on the development of a dual system of schools, the influence of federal reform efforts, and the impact of Alaska reform efforts. I conclude by describing the current status of schooling in Alaska.

Throughout the chapter I use the terms "Alaska Native" or "Native" when I am referring to all of the indigenous people in the state. When I refer to a specific cultural/linguistic group or subgroup, I use the term with which people identify themselves (e.g. Aleut, Koyukon Athabaskan Indian, Inupiat Eskimo, Tlingit Indian, Yup'ik Eskimo). I follow the conventional pattern of using "American Indian" to describe Native American people outside the state of Alaska, and I use "Native American" when I refer to *all* indigenous people of the United States.

The Alaskan Context

Alaska has many features by which it is readily identified by people throughout the world. Traveling Alaskans discover that people in nearly all parts of the world have some familiarity with the midnight sun, weather extremes, rich oil fields, vast amounts of land, Mt. McKinley, or the Yukon River. These geographical features are responsible for much of what "Outsiders" perceive Alaska to be about. They have prompted many to describe it as a "land of contrasts" or a "land of extremes." The geographical and physical features *are* remarkable. With a land mass of 586,402 square miles, it is equal in size to one-third of the rest of the United States. Its far northern position isolates it from other states but places it within 47 miles of the former Soviet Union, and its 33,000-mile coastline is longer than the east and west coastlines of the contiguous states combined. Alaska has the highest mountain on the North American continent, the second longest river in America, two active volcanoes, over half the glaciers in the world, and spectacular aurora borealis. Its extension through two climactic zones and its summer sunlight and winter darkness account for great differences in temperature between summer and winter. It has rich oil, timber, coal, and gold resources, and its natural environment continues to support animals now absent in other locations. Alaska also has the most northern, the most western, and the most eastern locations in the United States (some of the Aleutian Islands are on the other side of the International Date Line).

Alaska is indeed a land of contrasts and extremes, but not only because of its physical features. The diversity of its people, along with major changes and events in the state since 1970, has resulted in social, political, economic, and educational contrasts that are no less remarkable. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the building of the trans-Alaska pipeline, decentralization of the state school system, establishment of a network of small rural high schools, and bilingual education legislation may not be as familiar as the geographical features of the state to non-Alaskans, but the impact of these events upon the everyday life of Alaskans is at least as significant.

83

The population of Alaska in the 1990 census was 550,000 people, including 86,000 of aboriginal ancestry—Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts, who collectively refer to themselves as Alaska Natives. The large majority of non-Native people are migrants from the Lower 48 states, with increasing numbers of Asian and Latin American immigrants. English is spoken by nearly everyone in the state. With twenty different Alaska Native languages, several Asian and European languages, and American dialects from all regions of the United States, there is an unusual linguistic diversity for such a small population.

With only 550,000 people spread over 586,402 square miles, Alaska has one of the lowest population densities in the world. There are three major urban areas, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau, as well as 20 smaller towns and about 180 villages. The urban areas of Alaska (Anchorage 227,000, Fairbanks 78,000 and Juneau 27,000) offer the same kinds of amenities found elsewhere in the United States. They have well-developed transportation systems, modern shopping complexes, fully-equipped homes, and extensive educational facilities. Most villages in Alaska are accessible only by air and, in some cases, by water. Even the state capital Juneau can be reached only by airplane or ferry, and it is as far from communities in northern and western Alaska as Colorado is from New York.

The majority of the residents in rural Alaska are Alaska Natives who live in villages with populations ranging between 25 and 5,000. Although an increasing number of Native people live in urban areas of the state, the terms rural and Native are frequently used interchangeably. Alaska Native people who live in rural areas maintain a distinct and unique lifestyle. Even though in most rural communities today one will see trucks, cars, snowmachines, refrigerators, televisions, telephones, and modern school buildings these will be next to log cabins, dog teams, fish wheels, food caches, meat drying racks, and outhouses. Each village has at least one store, but many Native residents continue to practice a subsistence lifestyle and depend heavily on moose, caribou, seal, walrus, whale, fish and berries for their supply of food.

Native people in Alaska identify with, and are organized into, distinct groups on the basis of language, culture and geographic location. The three primary groups are Eskimo, Indian and Aleut. Among these groups are four different Native language families (Eskimo-Aleut, Athabaskan-Eyak, Tsimshian, and Haida), and these language families include 20 distinct Alaska Native languages. Although some of the twenty languages are related, they are different enough from one another that speakers of one language usually cannot understand speakers of another language. All of the Alaska Native languages are linguistically very different from the Indo-European languages, and few non-Natives, other than linguists, have become proficient speakers of an Alaska Native language. Children still speak their Native language as a first language in four of the languages. Alaska Native people often identify themselves with a tiered description: as Alaska Native, as belonging to a particular linguistic/cultural group (e.g. Aleut, Haida Indian or Siberian Yup'ik Eskimo) and as being a member of a particular region, village and/or family. In some areas, further clan distinctions are made.

The diverse geographic areas that Alaska Native people occupy dictate quite distinct life styles with a broad range of subsistence practices, modes of transportation, accessibility to others for economic and social functions, and political structures. Aleut people live on the Aleutian Islands and along the southern coast of the mainland (the name "Alaska" comes from the Aleut word for continent). Eskimo people live along the Northern and Western coastal areas of Alaska and include Yup'ik people who live in the Southwest—both inland and along the coasts of the Bering Sea; Inupiat people who live in the north primarily along the Arctic Sea; and Siberian Yup'ik people who live on two islands very near the Russia border. Indian people include 11 different groups of Athabaskans in the Interior, and Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian in the Southeast coastal area of Alaska. Although the actual population figures for Alaska Native people have changed since 1887 (a decrease beginning in 1867, and an increase in the past 20 years), the proportion of Alaska Native people across the three primary groups has remained fairly consistent: Eskimos at 56 percent, Indians at 34 percent, and Aleuts at 10 percent.

Although there are important differences among Alaska Native groups, most share with one another—and with other Native Americans—a set of beliefs that include the following: a priority of communal and family considerations over individual considerations; a belief in sharing versus accumulating; and a respect for spirituality and an interconnectedness with the natural world. These beliefs are encompassed in world views that sometimes clash in fundamental ways with Western views grounded in a Judeo-Christian belief system, economic capitalism and political democracy, and the values inherent in these beliefs and ideologies.

> In a number of ways, most Native American tribes interpreted life from a certain common perspective, employing a set of values sharply at odds with the assumptions of European civilization. When compared to one another, the tribes are highly diverse; but when all of them are compared to European society, a Native American culture becomes discernible—one that revolved around Native American visions of life, time, community, and the environment. (Olson & Wilson, 1984, p. 15)

Federal Indian Policy and Schooling in Alaska

When the United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, the policies, programs and relationships that had already developed between the government and American Indians directly influenced Native Americans in Alaska. Although many American Indian educational policies and programs were not designed specifically for Alaska Natives, they all have directly or indirectly influenced decisions about schooling in Alaska. Moreover, the policies established in this early period set a precedent for federal *and* state schooling practices for Alaska Natives that continues even today. Many current misunderstandings about educational policies for Alaska Native people are the result of misinformation about early federal practices that affected schooling in Alaska. Of particular consequence are the federal government's early actions in the negotiation of treaties with American Indian tribes, the establishment of reservations, and the adoption of the Civilization Fund Act.

Treaties

During the Revolutionary War, the colonial government opened treaty deliberations as a means of negotiating with Indians who controlled land, resources, and trade routes that the newcomers wanted access to. These treaties recognized the sovereignty and independent nation status of Indian tribes, and when the United States Constitution was written, it specifically authorized Congress to enter into these treaties. Included in almost every treaty were contractual, legally-binding agreements in which the federal government agreed to provide Indian people with education, health care, and social services in exchange for Indian-controlled resources. Between 1779 and 1871, 389 treaties were negotiated between the United States government and Indian groups, and through the process a precedent for federal control of Indian affairs, including education, was firmly established. The treaties also established the dual rights of Native Americans in United States society: special rights that evolved from the treaties and, eventually (in 1928), rights also as United States citizens. Treaties were the first instance in which federal responsibility for Native American schooling was identified, and since that time the government has legally extended its educational responsibility through other means including congressional acts, executive orders and court decisions.

While there continue to be many problems in following through on the *intent* of the treaties, of equal concern are some of the *unintended* consequences. The first was that many of the treaties were not honored by the United States government and this betrayal influenced further relationships. The second was that the treaties initiated a relationship of dependency. Indian people were forced to rely on the federal government for essential services because their traditional, and historically effective, means of providing these services for themselves was lost through displacements resulting from the treaty arrangements. Although Alaska Natives were not directly involved in formal treaty arrangements, the precedent of negotiating with the federal government for land, rights and resources, and the dependency that developed from the legacy of federal responsibility for education continue to be critical issues in Alaska today. Two federal-state-Alaska Native task forces are currently addressing the residual effects of this relationship—the Alaska Native Commission, and the Joint Federal-State Task Force on the role of the BIA in Alaska.

Reservations and Allotments

The process that led to the eventual development of a national system of reservations for Indians occurred over several decades, but was not formally instituted until the 1850s. The beliefs and assumptions that led government officials to recommend this type of institutional and jurisdictional structure are described and rationalized by the federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Luke Lea in 1850.

> It is indispensably necessary that [the Indians] be placed in positions where they can be controlled and finally compelled by sheer necessity to resort to agricultural labor or starve. Considering, as the untutored Indian does, that labor is a degradation, and that there is nothing worthy of his ambitions but prowess in war, success in the chase, and eloquence in council, it is only under such circumstances that his haughty pride can be subdued, and his wild energies trained to the more ennobling pursuits of civilized life. There should be assigned to each tribe, for a permanent home, a country adapted to agriculture, of limited extent and well-defined boundaries; within which all, with occasional exception, should be compelled constantly to remain until such time as their general improvement and good conduct may supersede the necessity of such restrictions. In the meantime, the government should...........secure to them the means and faculties of education, intellectual, moral, and religious. (Commissioner of Indian Affairs Report, 1850, as cited in Prucha, 1984)

This statement is a harsh reminder of the extreme ethnocentrism and moral righteousness of the time, and it provides an indication of the extent of power and control which government officials envisioned through the reservation system policy. Although Alaska, for the most part, was not directly affected by the reservation plan (the Annette Island Reserve for the Metlakatla Indian Community and the village of Venetie being the exceptions), the beliefs that led the United States government to support the policy were the same beliefs that shaped its future relationship with Native people in Alaska.

After the establishment of the reservations, the Dawes Act, also referred to as the Allotment Act, was passed in 1887 and caused an even further breakup of Native people. First divided by the creation of the reservations, Indian people's family and tribal systems were broken down even further when the government allotted small parcels of reservation land to individual Indians to promote private ownership and encourage agricultural pursuits. In a period of thirty-two years, 75 percent of this land was then sold to non-Natives. As a provision of the Dawes Act, the government again included education as a compensation for its actions. The government's justification for the Allotment Act is captured succinctly by David Adams (1988) when he describes the "coincidence of interests between two races . . . that Indians had land and needed civilization, and whites had civilization and needed land" (p. 18). Therefore, from the White man's perspective this was a fair trade. Prucha's (1984) comments about the eventual extension of the Allotment Act to Alaska (19 years later) are interesting. "The Alaska Allotment Act in 1906 extended to Alaska the provisions of the Dawes Act, allowing allotments of 160 acres to individual Indians that would give clear title to their homesites; but quarter-section allotments made little sense in the subsistence economy carried on by most Alaska Natives" (p. 1129).

Treaties, reservations, allotment policies, and boarding school programs, all of which were developed at about the same time, endorsed and ensured restricted environments in which the government could control all aspects of Native American life including education, religion, medicine, and law. Each of the federal initiatives served to sever connections between family members, villages and tribal units. In addition, the policies inaugurated a long-standing policy of assimilation through segregation (e.g. the goal of boarding schools was to assimilate Native American students into mainstream society by separating them from their communities). Federal policies were designed so that Natives and non-Natives had little occasion or opportunity to interact for educational, economic, social or political purposes, except for the often stilted interactions with outside government or missionary representatives on reservations or in the villages.

Treaties, reservations, and the Allotment plan dealt a blow to Native American initiative, pride and self respect, and the net effect of these policies has contributed to the cycle of poverty, disease, and high incidence of alcoholism that continues to impact many Native people today.

Civilization Fund Act

The Civilization Fund Act, passed in 1819, also had a direct impact on schooling practices. It appropriated an annual "civilizing" fund and initiated a program whereby the federal government contracted with religious groups to operate schools for Native children—a policy that continued to influence Native education long after it was declared unconstitutional in the 1890s. With the passage of this act, the federal government established *a second legal basis* for federal responsibility for schooling for *all* Indian children (not just those covered under treaty arrangements). The assumption that Indian people's needs would best be served through schools that promote "civilization" and Christianity has continued to be a powerful theme throughout the history of American Indian and Alaska Native education.

The Dual System of Schools in Alaska

The recorded history of the relationship of Native people in Alaska to the United States government begins almost 200 years after the history of relationships with other Native Americans because Alaska did not become part of the United States until it was purchased from Russia in 1867. Because few government, church and education records are available (in English) for the period of time Russians were in Alaska, we have only a limited understanding of their relations with Native people from the time of initial contact. We do know that Russian explorers, fur traders and missionaries had been in the country since the 1700s, and we know that the territory was sparsely settled by groups of indigenous people whose languages and cultures varied significantly.

Prior to the time of purchase, formal education for Alaska Native people came primarily from the efforts of the Russian Orthodox church and the Russian-American Company. They provided schools for Indian people in Southeast Alaska and for Aleut people in the Aleutian area. Literacy programs flourished, especially in the Aleutians, and many Aleut people became sophisticated readers and writers in both the Russian and the Aleut languages (Dauenhauer, 1982).

It was not until 1881, 17 years after Alaska became a territory of the United States, that the first official federal legislation impacting Alaska, the Organic Act, was passed. This act established the first civil government in Alaska, provided the legal basis for federal provision of education and affirmed that the United States Government did not recognize aboriginal ownership of land. The Act delegated responsibility for providing schooling "for children of all races" to the Office of the United States Secretary of the Interior. Four years later the task of providing education was specifically delegated to the Bureau of Education, a unit within the Department of the Interior. Federal involvement with Alaska Native education continues to the present day through the Bureau of Indian Affairs (the "BIA")—a unit in the Department of the Interior that assumed the responsibilities of the former Bureau of Education.

The Bureau of Education fulfilled its legal obligation to Alaska by providing schools that were consistent with its emerging comprehensive national Native American school system—a system based on the belief that it was possible to transform Native people into civilized and Christian Americans, and that the best mechanism for achieving assimilation into American society was education. There was little recognition of important differences between Native Americans in Alaska and those in the other states, and even less recognition of important differences among indigenous peoples within Alaska. Olson and Wilson (1984) speculate about why differences among Native Americans were overlooked.

> Europeans were blind to [the] diversity and insisted on viewing Native American culture through a single lens, as if all Native Americans could somehow be understood in terms of a few monolithic assumptions. Social life in colonial and frontier America was terribly complex—a cauldron of competing racial, religious, and linguistic groups—and settlers saw Native Americans as just one more group among many. . . . It is an irony that probably because of their own diversity, Europeans were unable to see Native Americans as anything more than a single group. Unlike black Africans, who came from diverse tribal backgrounds but were forced into one, highly integrated African American slave culture, Native Americans were divided tribally by economic organization, language, religion, and political loyalty. (p. 14)

In order to achieve the goals of civilizing and Christianizing Native children in Alaska, in the late 1800s, the federal government established day schools in villages and a limited number of vocational boarding schools. Instruction was provided in the three "R's," in industrial skills, and in patriotic citizenship. A strict "English-Only" policy governed all language and curriculum decisions. Some schools were operated directly by the federal government while others, referred to as "contract schools," were contracted to missionary groups (Catholic, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Moravian, Presbyterian, and Swedish-Evangelical).

By the early 1900s, the number of non-Native people coming into the Territory of Alaska had increased steadily due to the discovery of gold and the development of commercial fishing and timber industries. Because the federal Bureau of Education was not able to provide adequate schooling for all of the newcomers, the United States Congress granted authority to individual communities in Alaska to incorporate and establish schools, and maintain them through taxation. Many small, non-Native towns did this and opened schools immediately. However, several communities that were too small to incorporate still desired some degree of regional autonomy in the management of their schools. Consequently, in 1905 Congress passed the Nelson Act that provided for the establishment of schools outside incorporated towns. The governor of Alaska was made the ex-officio superintendent, and new schools were established, but only "white children and children of mixed blood leading a civilized life" were entitled to attend. Thus, *a dual system of education in Alaska* was inaugurated, with schools for Native students run by the federal Bureau of Education, and schools for White children and a small number of "civilized" Native children operated by the Territory of Alaska and incorporated towns.

The federal Bureau of Education, meanwhile, continued to extend its services to more remote sections of Alaska, and by 1931 it had assumed responsibility for the social welfare and education of most rural Native people. Its expanded services included not only education, but medical services, the Reindeer Service (i.e. an effort to bolster the economy for Alaska Natives by introducing reindeer herding), cooperative stores, operation of a ship (the North Star) for supplying isolated villages, and the maintenance of an orphanage and three industrial schools. In Alaska, as in other places in the United States, the autonomy and self-sufficiency of Native people continued to erode as the federal government assumed greater responsibility over their lives and livelihood. Most of the elders in Alaska Native communities today (and several of the grandparents of the university students in this study) were the "recipients" or "victims" of these early federal Indian policies and practices.

In 1928 an extensive survey of Indian social and economic conditions was commissioned, and from it the Meriam Report was issued. The report was highly critical of Indian education (and of most other Bureau of Education programs too). It was the first major report to document and bring to the nation's attention the status of Indian conditions. The report's recommendations called for a major reformation of Indian education with Indian involvement at all levels of the educational process and with specific recommendations that education be tied to communities, day schools extended, boarding schools reformed, Indian culture included in the development of the curriculum, and field services decentralized. These recommendations continue to be referenced, and relevant, even today. At the time the report was prepared approximately 40 percent of all Native American children attended federal BIA schools and about 80 percent of this group were in boarding schools. Only a handful of government schools offered instruction above the eighth grade level, and the teacher turnover rate was nearly 50 percent per year. In Alaska in the late 1920s, the majority of Alaska Native students were enrolled in BIA day schools in villages where the teacher turnover rate was even higher than the national average, and few were able to attend the limited number of BIA or church-affiliated boarding high schools.

Using the Meriam Report as both a catalyst and blueprint, John Collier, Sr., Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1934 to 1945, initiated a major shift in Indian policy in the United States. During his administration, a wide variety of new programs were implemented—nearly all with the goal of providing Indian self-determination in economic development, social services and education. Two pieces of legislation that supported these goals, the Indian Reorganization Act and the Johnson-O'Malley Act (both commonly referred to today by their initials) were enacted in 1934, and both had long term effects on United States Indian policy, and a direct impact on Alaska Native people that continues today.

The Indian Reorganization Act provided for Indian political self-government and economic self-determination by allowing tribes to organize and incorporate. It was the first piece of legislation that addressed, and attempted to counter, the economic destruction that had resulted from treaty negotiations and reservation allotment policies. However, Alaska Natives were once again slighted in the process due to an oversight in the law. To remedy the oversight Congress passed the Alaska Reorganization Act in 1936 which authorized the creation of reservations on land occupied by Alaska Natives. However, since Alaska Natives were less "tribally oriented" than other Native Americans, they were granted special permission to establish "village" governments and constitutions, and most groups chose this option (Olson & Wilson, 1984).

The Johnson-O'Malley (JOM) Act initiated a new federal approach to Native American education that was based on the Meriam Report recommendations—emphasizing that Indian education should be closely tied to communities. This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior (specifically the BIA) to negotiate contracts with any state or territory to provide federal funds to help the states or territories defray expenses they incurred for education, medical aid, agricultural assistance, and social welfare programs they provided for Native Americans. In Alaska, this call for more local control led to the beginning of negotiations between the Alaska Territorial Department of Education and the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the transfer of federally-operated rural BIA elementary schools to the territory. Between 1942 and 1948, 20 BIA schools were transferred to the territory. The Territory and the BIA continued to pursue the unification of the dual system of education and by the mid 1950s, 22 more school transfers were completed.

In the early 1950s, about 50 percent of Alaska Native students were in territory-supported public schools and 50 percent were in BIA schools, the same ratio as nationwide at that time. Alaska Native students who attended the territory-supported public schools in urban areas were in racially integrated schooling environments, whereas students who lived in smaller incorporated towns with Native and non-native populations, where there were both federal BIA and territory schools, continued to attend school in a racially segregated environment. The majority of Alaska Native students attended elementary school in their own rural villages where there was only one school—run either by the Territory or by the BIA. In these settings most of the school population was Alaska Native because it reflected the population of the village—not because of restrictive official or unofficial educational policies. The only options open to Alaska Natives in small rural communities who wished to attend high school were the distant BIA boarding high schools, with the exception of a few church-affiliated boarding high schools in some areas of the state.

Although there were several reasons for continuing the merger between the federal and territorial school systems, the momentum that began in the early 1950s came to an abrupt halt shortly after. By 1954 efforts to bring the two school systems together ceased—for a variety of reasons, some at a national level and some within the state. In the years following World War II, the pendulum of federal Indian policy had begun to move back toward "de-Indianizing the Indian" once again. As a result of the just-concluded war and as a response to the developing Cold War, an insistence on conformity to national, narrowly-defined standards became prevalent. At the same time, the new postwar economy supported private economic growth and reduced government spending. This conservative political and economic environment led to the passage of legislation legalizing the termination of Native Americans' official relationships with the government in 1953, and to the establishment of programs to relocate Native Americans to urban areas in 1954.

The reversal of public support for Native American self-determination impacted Alaska where the educational reform efforts recommended by the Meriam Report and the Collier administration had just begun to be implemented. In the mid 1950s Alaska was placing a great deal of time, effort and money into its bid for statehood, and the motivation for federal and state education officials to work together to develop a unified system for rural Alaska Native education waned significantly. Therefore, when Alaska did achieve statehood in 1959, the state and federal school systems were still a dual presence in rural Alaska. Although some of the most negative consequences of the original dual system no longer existed (i.e. single communities in which students attended separate schools on the basis of race), many of the other negative consequences of the dual system continued (e.g. lack of coordination, high expenses, duplication of services).

The serious lack of documentation about schooling in Alaska's rural areas makes it difficult to really understand what kinds of differences existed in schools operated by the BIA as compared to those operated by the territory. The stories of Alaska Native people who attended rural elementary schools in both systems (e.g. some of the students who participated in this study and several of their parents) suggest that the federally mandated policies of the BIA schools provided fewer opportunities for community input and participation in matters related to school design, language use, curriculum, and hiring of school personnel than did the territory/public schools.

It was not until 1965 that the state began to pay attention once again to the educational needs of Alaska Native people in rural areas. It established the Division of State-Operated Schools (SOS) with special responsibility for rural and on-base military schools, and created a governor's committee to again explore the merger of BIA and state schools. Fifteen years later, there were still 43 BIA schools in Alaska and the final transfer of federal schools to the state school system did not occur until 1986.

Many of the students in this study, and nearly all of their parents and grandparents, attended Alaska's rural schools during the period of time when schooling policies and practices reflected the ambiguity of state and national beliefs about the best way to educate Native American students. Many students' parents were not able to complete the eighth grade, and most did not have the opportunity to enroll in high school. The policies of the BIA and territory schools attended by some students and by nearly all of their parents and grandparents forbade students to speak their Native languages and did not allow for a curriculum that reflected anything Alaskan, Native American, or Alaska Native. Only rarely did students in this study have the opportunity to be taught by an Alaska Native teacher.

Federal Educational Reform Efforts

At the beginning of this chapter I referred to events after 1970 in Alaska that "caused the development of social, political, economic, and educational contrasts" and I mentioned the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the building of the trans-Alaska pipeline, decentralization of the state school system, establishment of a network of small rural high schools, and bilingual education legislation. Each of these did have a major impact on Alaska Native education, and although each was specific to Alaska, all were influenced to some extent by events in the rest of the United States.

By the mid 1960s and early 1970s, a new awareness and unease was developing in the United States about the increasing economic and academic disparity between different groups of people, usually on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, religion or social class. Public demonstrations, civil rights pressures, and independence movements were prevalent in countries all around the world. In the United States, the Civil Rights Movement and the Women's Movement were two efforts that led to new legislation and to court decisions that directly and indirectly affected members of all ethnic and cultural minority groups.

Native American people capitalized on the vigorous and supportive mood of this period and became sophisticated public advocates for Native American causes by formally organizing themselves into groups, and by using the established tools of other activist groups (e.g. lobbying, use of publicity, legal expertise, demonstrations, grass-roots efforts). Several pan-Indian groups were formed, ranging from special interest groups like the National Indian Education Association (NIEA) and the National Tribal Chairman's Association to the often-militant American Indian Movement (AIM). These groups did not challenge, but served to strengthen, the central positions of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) which had been organized in 1944.

Best-selling books by Indian authors Dee Brown, Vine Deloria and Scott Momaday, as well as movies like Little Big Man and A Man Called Horse helped to promote interest in and garner support for Native Americans. The popular media helped, but sometimes hindered, Native American people as they began to increase their use of activism and confrontation to achieve their ends. The seizure of Alcatraz by "Indians of All Tribes" in 1969, the occupation of BIA Headquarters by participants in the "Trail of Broken Treaties" in 1972, and the seizure of the community of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota in 1973 all contributed to establishing a public awareness (and sometimes, a sense of guilt) that led to the development of federal initiatives in the 1970s and 1980s.

To organize and describe the virtual flood of federal activity that occurred between 1965 and 1990 in the area of Native American education, I have organized the major national-level educational initiatives into two categories: federal programs designed for all students, and federal programs designed for Native Americans.

Federal Programs For All Students

Government efforts aimed at providing equal opportunities proliferated during the Great Society period of the 1960s with its bold attempts to fight the "war on poverty," and these continued well into the 1970s. Education was identified as both a cause and a cure of inequality, and efforts to equalize schooling opportunities assumed a position of prominence in many of the reform efforts during this time. Although funding for several federal programs decreased in the 1980s, the momentum generated by the earlier actions continued.

A number of general and comprehensive programs had a direct impact on Native American education programs and policies. The creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in 1964 provided not only Headstart and Community Action Programs (CAP) in which many Alaska Native people and village governments participated; it also created a model for collaboration between the federal government and local communities. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 represented the first major involvement of the federal government in education for children other than Native Americans.

It was designed to meet the special needs of children in low-income families, and included special appropriations to public school districts enrolling Native American children. The Civil Rights Act of 1968 included five titles dealing specifically with Native Americans. Several parts of Title VII Bilingual Education legislation had immediate implications for many Native American students as well.

Federal Programs for Native Americans

As Native Americans continued to make public demands for local control, they developed a broad base of support. In addition to the efforts already described, special congressional subcommittees, independent research associations and grass roots organizations each used their own tools and their persuasive efforts to usher in a wide array of new programs.

Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon all established Presidential task forces to examine the role of the BIA. The most consequential of these was the Kennedy Task Force on Indian Affairs. Its report Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge (U.S. Senate, 1969) was a grave censure of federal Indian policy. An independent group of researchers prepared a report that condemned the policy to terminate Native American relationships with the federal government. The book published from this report, The Indian, America's Unfinished Business (Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian, 1967), called for Indian control of social, political and education services. A National Study of American Indian Education, funded by the United States Department of Education, also published a book, To Live on This Earth (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972), which was critical of government policies. In 1991 yet another report, Indian Nations at Risk: An Educational Strategy for Action (U.S. Department of Education), reinforced many of the same positions. Each of these reports echoed the findings of the 1928 Meriam Report and reaffirmed that serious problems still existed and the recommendations offered were still valid—50 years later.

In 1972, the Indian Education Act was passed which mandated parental involvement and local control of some educational services for Native Americans. It was directed at meeting the needs of Native American students in public schools, where two-thirds of Native school children were then enrolled. The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 provided authority for tribes to contract directly with the BIA to conduct or administer all or part of any of the Indian programs conducted by the federal Department of the Interior. The 1978 Educational Amendments (Public Law 95-561) provided more opportunities for control and decision-making authority in local public schools boards. The first schools to assert local Indian control were the Rough Rock Demonstration School in 1966 and the Navajo Community College in 1969 in Arizona.

Although the Bureau of Indian Affairs had official responsibility for formulating Native American policy, most of the federal educational reform efforts during this period were initiated elsewhere (e.g. Congress, the President's Office, and other government agencies). Native Americans also began to advance to prominent roles within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and a National Indian Education Advisory Commission, with membership restricted to Native Americans, was established to report to the President and the Secretary of the Interior.

During this same period, many other significant legislative, executive, and judicial decisions were made in favor of Native Americans' sovereignty, land, and resource rights. Although some did not directly relate to education, all clearly had an effect on it, as becomes evident when considering the impact of land and resource issues upon the programs and policies in Alaska education over the past 25 years.

The discovery of oil and the subsequent passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act provided the State of Alaska with a great deal of money, and provided Native people with the power and economic status they had not previously held. When oil was discovered on the North Slope of Alaska in 1968, the major oil companies involved immediately applied to the federal government for a right-of-way permit to initiate the largest private construction project in recent United States history. They wanted to build an 800 mile oil pipeline that would extend from Prudhoe Bay in the north to Valdez on the Gulf of Alaska. Since the time of the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867, Alaska Native people had not been compensated for their aboriginal land or granted title to any more than small parcels. Therefore, when oil was found, it became clear that Native claims would have to be settled before a pipeline right-of-way permit could be issued to the large oil companies. Natives claimed ownership to land that the pipeline would cross, as well as the land on which the oil fields themselves were located.

After five years of negotiation between the oil industry, federal and state governments, Alaska Native leadership, and environmentalists, a permit for construction of the pipeline was issued, and construction finally began in 1973. Four years later this major technological feat was completed, and Alaska became an important supplier of United States oil. Thus, it was the discovery of the rich oil fields that finally provided the impetus for the state and federal governments to enter into serious negotiations on the long-standing land and compensation disputes with the Native people of Alaska. Through their collective efforts, they achieved what, at the time was "perhaps the most comprehensive and far-reaching legal settlement of aboriginal claims to land and its resources yet witnessed in the contemporary world—the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA" (Gaffney, 1977, p. 29). Through ANCSA, Alaska Natives received title to 40 million acres of land (this process has not yet been completed), and $962.5 million dollars. In order to use this land and invest this money in ways that would collectively benefit the Native community, 12 regional Native profit-making corporations were established that coincided with the various cultural and linguistic regions of Alaska. These regional corporations became the largest landowners in Alaska, outside of the state and federal governments.

Today, these 12 Native corporations function like business corporations anywhere in the world. They are governed by corporate laws, are directly responsible to their Native shareholders, and are free to engage in any production or investment profit-making activities, such as hotel construction, oil exploration and drilling, fish processing plant operations, and local business enterprises. Within each of the 12 regions many village-based corporations were also established by ANCSA, along with nonprofit organizations designed to administer a wide range of social service and educational programs, many of which were formerly under the control of the BIA and other federal and state government agencies. The non-profit corporations now annually administer over one hundred million dollars for education, health, employment, and social programs.

Alaska Educational Reform Efforts Since 1970

An indication of the level of disorder that existed in the rural educational system in Alaska even in the 1970s (when the parents of some of the UAF students in this study were of high school age) can be found in the account of federal policies described by Margaret Szasz (1974). She indicates that in the late 1960s Alaska was viewed by the BIA as a major educational problem area, second only to the Navajo Reservation. Although more than half of Alaska Native children were enrolled in state public schools, a significant number were still in BIA elementary day schools. When these "overage" and "underachieving" children, as labeled by the BIA, completed the eighth grade they presented "a real problem for the enrollment-conscious Branch of Education" of the BIA because of the lack of high school facilities in Alaska (pp. 127-128).

Szasz (1974) describes the situation one year in the late 1960s when there were 400 eighth-grade graduates from rural elementary schools for whom there was no space available in the BIA high school boarding facilities available to Alaska students (i.e. Mt. Edgecumbe, Wrangell and Nome-Beltz in Alaska and Chemawa in Oregon). The BIA therefore enrolled 204 Alaska Native students in the Chilocco BIA High School in Oklahoma. Szasz reports that, although a small percentage of these students returned to Alaska before Christmas, most of them stayed through the first year—"perhaps in part because Bureau leaders made it difficult if not impossible for students to leave. . . Each student, the Juneau, Alaska Area [BIA] Director advised, must be encouraged, persuaded, and even discreetly forced to remain at Chilocco" (p. 127). The Bureau attitude was based on the premise that if the student failed at Chilocco there was no other educational avenue open. Szasz surmises that:

> Without question, the decision to use the space at Chilocco was attuned to Bureau goals rather than to the needs of the students. Restricted by budgetary limitations and anxious to increase the percentage of pupils in school, the Branch of Education juggled students to fit spaces, regardless of the effect on the students themselves. (pp. 127-128)

In 1971, the Alaska State legislature attempted to attend to the chaos in Alaska's rural schools by making the Alaska State-Operated School System an independent agency with responsibility for rural schools. However, pressure for more local control brought legislative action again in 1975 that abolished this system and in its place set up 21 separate school districts in rural Alaska, referred to as Regional Educational Attendance Areas (REAAs)—the system that is currently in operation.

As a result of this massive decentralization effort, the REAAs (like school districts in urban areas) have assumed responsibility for educating children in their regional area. Each REAA has its own locally elected school board and its own superintendent, and although the responsibilities of the school boards and administrators vary from region to region, many of the boards today are directly involved in establishing policies for budgets, hiring, and developing curriculum. There are state guidelines in all areas of education, but each REAA has enough latitude to design the schooling process in ways that will make it most appropriate for its particular region. Special services and some additional resources are provided to the REAAs and to other public schools through the Alaska Department of Education in Juneau. Schools in the REAAs are funded on the basis of a state formula that provides full funding for schools in all communities that are not incorporated. The level of state support for schools in Alaska ranks among the top in the United States.

The establishment of regional school districts did not, however, respond to the need for high schools in rural areas. There was in fact no comprehensive effort to remedy this problem by the state or federal governments until a lawsuit was filed against the State of Alaska in 1974. The class-action suit, charging discriminatory practice on the part of the state, was filed by Alaska Legal Services, on behalf of all rural secondary-aged students, for not providing local high school facilities for predominantly Native communities when it did for several same-size, predominantly non-Native, communities.

The Hootch family, whose daughter the suit was named after, lived in the Yup'ik Eskimo community of Emmonak, with a population of about 400 people. Like most other rural Alaska Native families, they faced the prospect of sending their high school-aged child away from home for the entire school year. Secondary students in nearly all rural and Native communities in Alaska had been sent to federal Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools in southeast Alaska, Oregon, Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, or, for a short time in the 1970s, to state boarding schools and boarding home programs in larger Alaskan communities.

The case was argued on grounds of racial discrimination, and in 1976, the Governor of Alaska signed a consent decree as settlement of what had become the Tobeluk v. Lind case because Molly Hootch was no longer in school. In the settlement, the state of Alaska agreed that it would establish a high school program in *every* community in Alaska where there was an elementary school (which required a minimum enrollment of eight students) and one or more secondary students, unless the community specifically declined such a program.

Subsequent legislation and funding brought about sweeping and dramatic changes in the educational system in Alaska. During the year after settlement of the case nearly 30 new high schools were established with staffs of one to six teachers and student enrollments in the new high schools ranging from 5 to 100. During the next seven years, the state invested $133 million in the development of approximately 90 more small high schools. Today there are over 120 small high schools in Alaska villages, nearly all operated by the REAA in which they are located. Twenty-two of the 50 student participants in this study were among the first generation of Alaska Native students who were able to attend high school in their own community.

Decentralization of the state educational system, establishment of REAAs with power vested in their regional and local school boards, and the construction of 120 new small high schools did not occur simply because federal policies had paved the way for new organizational structures that made self-determination a viable option. These events were, in fact, made possible by social, political and economic occurrences outside the educational arena.

Alaska Schools Today

Today, nearly all Alaska Native students entering the University of Alaska system have attended elementary and secondary school in one of three settings.

1. Village Schools

In rural village schools, students are usually in multi-graded settings, instruction in the early years may be in a Native language (especially in a Yup'ik or Inupiat community), and most schools have an Alaska Native cultural component in the curriculum. Community members serve as classroom and bilingual teacher aides in most village schools.

2. Urban schools

Nearly all urban schools in Alaska now include some programs designed specifically for students who identify themselves as Alaska Native or Native American students. These are funded primarily through federal programs (e.g. Johnson-O'Malley, Indian Education Act), and sometimes supported with state and/or district funds. The special programs often include in-school academic tutoring, community cultural events, provision of a "school-within-a-school," or cultural heritage activities. Urban communities in Alaska include Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau.

3. Rural Regional Center and Road System/Marine Highway Schools

The elementary and secondary schools in the larger rural communities (Barrow, Bethel, Kotzebue, Nome, etc.) where the population is 30 to 50 percent non-Native, and in the "road system or marine highway" schools (schools accessible by car or ferry and primarily non-Native, such as Glenallen and Tok, or Ketchikan and Sitka) have characteristics of both the village schools and the urban schools. Many of these schools are administered by the same REAA district or borough that administers the village schools in that region. The range of special programs for Native students varies significantly within this group, depending on their representation in the population.

Despite the differences among these three school settings, there are some important commonalties across schools in Alaska. All of the schools that enroll Native American students are now required by federal regulations or by their organizational structure to include parents and other community members in the decision-making process. No school districts in the state have a proportion of Native teachers commensurate with the proportion of Native students. Only 4.0 percent of all teachers in the state are Alaska Native, and the percentage of administrators is even smaller. There are however a few village schools where 50 percent or more of the faculty is Alaska Native. Eighty-five percent of the teachers in Alaska have received their training outside the state, and the annual teacher turnover rate in the rural schools continues to be high—up to 30 percent in some areas.

Comments

Native American education, and Alaska Native education, have histories that are complex and tightly interwoven. A comprehensive knowledge of these histories is essential for understanding and interpreting the educational institutions, programs and policies that have evolved to serve Native people. Alaska's educational history has essentially been one of a movement toward self-determination and self-control—in education, tribal government and social services. The passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the decentralization of the federal and state school systems, and the rapid development of an extensive network of village high schools have brought about major transitions in a very short period of time. These events have also brought to the surface many of the dilemmas and contradictions in Native American educational policy. The inherent paradox in a system that requires the government to provide education for Native Americans while at the same time promoting self-determination has not yet been resolved. And the fundamental question of whether or not it is possible for the federal government to maintain its legally-binding trust responsibility, as defined by constitutional, congressional and judicial actions, without maintaining some level of control has yet to be answered.

Alaska Native students at the University of Alaska in this study brought with them a far more diverse set of educational experiences than have any group of Native students in the past. They grew up in a political, social, economic and educational environment that was dramatically different, not only from that of their parents, but even from that experienced by their older brothers and sisters.

It is important to be aware of the differences that exist within the group of 50 students, and to remember that they do not all share the same set of educational experiences; that their educational experiences are not a direct parallel with Native Americans in the other 49 states; and that their experiences have not been the same as other minority groups in the United States. The following is a summary of characteristics that distinguish Alaska Native students who currently attend the University of Alaska Fairbanks, as well as many of those in this study.

- Many of their parents did not complete elementary school or have the opportunity to go to high school, and most are the first generation of students from their family, or village, to attend college.

- They have grown up in a political milieu in which Alaska Native people (especially legislators and corporate officials), for the first time, wield economic and political power that is being used to impact schooling.

- They are shareholders in their own corporations, as a result of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and most have participated in village and regional corporation activities.

- They have been the focus of national and international attention in the past few years as a result of events such as the oil spill of the Exxon Valdez, the plight of the whales stuck in the ice in Barrow, renewed efforts to open up Arctic land for further oil development, and continuing unresolved issues dealing with Native hunting and fishing rights.

- They are the first generation to grow up with telephones, TVs and VCRs in their homes, and computers and audioconferencing equipment in their classrooms.

- They are members of a minority group that continues to rank at the lower end of the spectrum in the United States and in Alaska, on measures related to income, educational attainment, infant mortality rates, life expectancy, alcoholism, suicide and accidental death.

In the following chapter I examine the context and climate of the University of Alaska Fairbanks—the next schooling environment in which many Alaska Native people continue their formal education. I look specifically at the ways in which it has responded to the interests and needs of its increasing population of Alaska Native students.

CHAPTER 5

ALASKA NATIVE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AT UAF: CHALLENGES AND CHANGES

In 1971 I was hired as a teacher for deaf and hard-of-hearing students in the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District. To meet the requirements for Alaska teacher certification I needed to acquire six academic credits during my first year. I was pleased with the prospect of being able to take courses that would help me learn more about teaching in an Alaskan environment, since my teaching assignment included Alaska Native students, students from rural areas, and students for whom English was a second language. However, I was surprised and disappointed to discover that few such courses were available at the University of Alaska. There were only three options: two anthropology courses, and one education course that was described as an "interdisciplinary study of problems encountered by teachers in educating culturally atypical pupils" (University of Alaska Catalog, 1970-71, p. 178). I chose to wait for the summer sessions when visiting professors came to the university to offer courses that were more appropriate for my needs.

Two years later I decided to begin a master's degree program at the University of Alaska. Once again I discovered there was little coursework and no degree options that would allow me to study those issues that I thought would help me to be a successful teacher in Alaska. I therefore met with faculty members who had expertise in the areas in which I wished to study (Alaska Native languages, anthropology, education, linguistics, psychology, and sociolinguistics) and with their assistance, I developed a proposal for what we all agreed was a rigorous interdisciplinary master's degree in "Language and Cross-Cultural Education." Since it was an interdisciplinary degree, the plan needed to be approved at several administrative levels in the university.

With proposal in hand (and with a great deal of confidence), I met with the first of the administrators whose approval was critical to the acceptance of my proposal. He read it carefully and then told me, in a kind and thoughtful manner, that I would be putting my professional career in jeopardy if I pursued this academic route. He explained that the areas of study I wished to pursue were considered "fringe" and that if I received a master's degree in an area that included a cross-cultural emphasis it would impede my opportunities for "moving up" within the Fairbanks schools, and it would threaten my chances of getting accepted into quality graduate schools. He urged me to take advantage of the opportunities for research that were already available to me on the Fairbanks campus and pursue one of the standard degrees listed in the catalog. At the end of our meeting, he reluctantly agreed to sign my proposal, but only after I acknowledged that I fully understood that I was taking a personal and professional risk in making this decision. Nevertheless, I chose to proceed with my plans.

My experience typifies the situation that existed at UAF and at many other colleges and universities in the early seventies, when issues of multiculturalism were just beginning to challenge the standard modus operandi of higher education institutions. Twenty-five years ago, in 1969, there were few Alaska Native students, faculty or staff on the Fairbanks campus and only one student support service office with an Alaska Native or rural emphasis—Student Orientation Services (SOS). Very few courses in education, humanities or social sciences included information on Alaska Native people or issues—in fact, almost nothing on the Fairbanks campus reflected the presence of Alaska Native people in the state.

In 1969 UAF was, however, well on its way to establishing itself as a major research university. Although it was unusual for a campus as small as UAF to have such a strong research emphasis, the far northern geographic location enhanced and contributed to its potential to make important research contributions. The development of several institutes in the physical and biological sciences contributed significantly to this impetus, and by 1969 the university's goals and priorities were beginning to reflect that of other research universities.

Twenty-five years later, UAF is recognized and referred to as the state's major research center (and 90th in research and development spending out of the nation's top research and development universities), and during the same period of time it has *also* become known as the center for Alaska Native studies (UAF Fact Book, 1991). Today the Fairbanks campus of UAF has at least 27 programs or services that directly relate to Alaska Native issues and Alaska Native people, and it has 78 courses that include information about Alaska Native or rural Alaska issues. Prospective UAF students from around the United States now read in national publications that the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) is:

> the major research center for Alaska, [and as such it] offers unusual opportunities for studies relating to the northern environment, including engineering, fisheries science, geological engineering, natural resource management, physical sciences, petroleum engineering, rural development, Russian studies, and wildlife management. *It is also the state's center for study in Alaskan native cultures and languages* [emphasis added]. (Cass and Cass-Liepmann, 1994, p. 7)

What happened during this short time period? What were some of the factors and subsequent changes that propelled UAF into a position where it is now described as "the state's center for study in Alaska Native cultures and languages" as well as "the state's center for research?" Has the UAF community responded to and resolved the concerns expressed by my graduate advisor who, like many others, was convinced that the goals and reputation of a developing research university would be threatened by, and not compatible with, the development of a campus that responded to multicultural issues in general and to Alaska Native issues in particular?

In Chapter 4, I reviewed the home, community and schooling contexts of Alaska Native students—the legacy they bring to UAF. In this chapter, I examine some of the salient features of the Fairbanks campus to provide a foundation for understanding and interpreting the descriptions of Alaska Native students' experiences in Chapters 6 and 7. I focus specifically on the context of the Fairbanks campus and examine several factors that have been instrumental in shaping UAF's response to Alaska Native people and issues by presenting: (1) a description of the characteristics of research universities generally as a basis for interpreting information about the past and current campus climate in Fairbanks; (2) a brief overview of the vocabulary of the multicultural movement; (3) a description of the response of UAF to multiculturalism and specifically, a documentation of the actual changes that have been made in the past 25 years on the Fairbanks campus of UAF in response to Alaska Native students and issues; and (4) a review of the factors that influenced the changes at UAF.

The University of Alaska Fairbanks and the Research University Context

In the United States the four conventional categories used for identifying the major types of higher education institutions are two year community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and research universities. Institutions are placed into this Carnegie Classification system based on the comprehensiveness of the institution's mission as determined by the following: level of degrees offered, number of Ph.D's awarded each year and the range of disciplines in which they are awarded, commitment to graduate education, amount of federal support received, and level of priority given to research (Boyer, 1990, pp. 129-30). An institution's ranking helps determine its eligibility for certain types of funding, allows it to be grouped with similar institutions for comparisons, and influences its ability to compete for students and faculty.

Although differences in the cultural mores of these various categories of higher education institutions are generally not well understood by people outside the system, *or* by many students and non-faculty participants within the university, higher education literature is filled with references to explicit and implicit differences among categories of institutions. When I began to look deliberately for descriptions of these differences, I was surprised to discover that a fairly explicit and agreed-upon set of characteristics define the qualities of most research-oriented universities in the United States. I was also interested to find how frequently community colleges, liberal arts colleges and research universities were described as having different "cultures" because of their different emphases.

UAF is officially classified as a "comprehensive university" and not as a research university because, even though it has graduate programs, it does not meet all of the criteria of a research university (e.g. it does not award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees each year). However, the lack of this official classification has not prevented UAF from choosing to identify itself, in its publications and in the information sent to national college guides, as a research institution. From the time the Geophysical Institute was established in 1949, the Fairbanks campus has prided itself on being a research center, and today it is the campus that is described as "the university's principal research center" (UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94, p. 5) within the wider University of Alaska system.

The University of Alaska Fairbanks' self-conscious pride in being viewed as a research institution was evident when I began my graduate studies, and it has continued to be an important part of its identity. This is evident in current descriptions in UAF's undergraduate and graduate catalogs, its fund-raising brochures, the UA and UAF "fact books," and the information provided to the commercially published guides to colleges such as the Comparative Guide to American Colleges (Cass and Cass-Liepmann, 1994). Other evidence that UAF considers itself a research institution can be found in the title of university convocations such as the first one by its new provost in 1994 ("Leadership in a Research University" by Jack Keating) and in its membership in the "Holmes Group" even though membership is restricted to officially-recognized research institutions. (The Holmes Group is a national consortium of 96 American research universities whose focus is the improvement of teacher education.) UAF appears therefore to be the type of institution that Irving Spitzberg and Virginia Thorndike (1992) describe as "*a comprehensive school that espouses the norms of a research institution*" [italics added] (p. 129).

What are some of the features, and the subsequent implications of being, or "espousing to be," a research university? Since it is necessary to have a common understanding of what is implied when an institution is described this way, and since UAF's identity as a "research university" is germane to documenting its past and present orientation to Alaska Native programs and people, the following is a brief review of some of the commonly ascribed characteristics that define the "culture" of research universities.

In his book about the growth of American research universities, Roger Geiger (1986) examines the emergence of research as a fundamental goal in higher education and observes that in 1920 "American research universities had established patterns of structure, intellectual organization, and financing that are still recognizable today" (p. 3). The popular media quite effectively presents, to the general public, information on the financial benefits that accrue to those universities that secure research grants, but there is little information available to non-academics about "the structural and intellectual organizational" implications of being a university with a research focus. Drawing upon the work of several authors (Bok, 1992; Boyer, 1987; Carnegie Foundation, 1990; Edgerton, 1994; Geiger, 1986; Goodlad, 1990; P. Smith, 1990; Spitzberg & Thorndike, 1992; Tierney, 1993a), I describe some of the common features of a United States research university.

The single most distinguishing characteristic of research institutions is the existence of a rigid and well-defined hierarchical system built around research productivity as the basis for determining academic rank, tenure and appointments within an academic unit. Position in this hierarchy depends to a great extent upon an individual's academic research efforts—the often referred to "publish or perish" imperative—and the rewards for those who make research their top priority are quite different from the rewards for those who do not. A wide schism often exists between people whose primary responsibility and interest is research and those whose primary responsibility and interest is in teaching or in student personnel work. According to Spitzberg and Thorndike,

> The majority of professors at [research] institutions embrace a culture in which faculty are first and foremost researchers; their role is to advance knowledge and provide services through consulting to government and industry . . . undergraduates are sometimes seen as a distraction from the real work of faculty . . . colleagues and administrators do not reward good teaching. . . . At most research institutions, faculty are told, directly or indirectly, to devote their time to research and subordinate teaching and service. (1992, p. 128)

Faculty members whose primary interest is research usually align themselves closely with discipline-based groups at national or international levels, and research and writing for these groups usually takes priority over more immediate institutional, local or regional needs. There is also uneven status among different departments and faculties in research universities. Physical and biological science faculty frequently have disproportionate status within research universities as reflected by their larger share of resources.

At a typical research university, tenure-track faculty usually teach few lower division or undergraduate classes, as it is a common and accepted practice for faculty to use research money to "buy themselves out" of teaching. There is little or no incentive for faculty to spend time with undergraduate students and consequently there is often minimal interaction between faculty and students out of class.

In most research institutions, the cultural and institutional norms associated with academic freedom and First Amendment rights (i.e. the principles of freedom of speech, publication and association as provided for in the United States Constitution) are more evident than in other types of institutions. This has helped contribute to the development of a university culture that is supportive of faculty members' rights to teach and write as they wish, to determine their own course content and to exercise a remarkable amount of freedom within their own classrooms which function as "sacred territory" within the framework of university culture (Bok, 1992, p. 18). This tends to result in courses being offered as a loose collection of discrete components, with little coordination and integration across faculty, programs or academic departments. The high degree of faculty independence also has contributed to the reputation of research universities as institutions in which it is very difficult to implement significant change.

The characteristics briefly described—value of research over teaching, higher status for those in science faculties, minimal contact between faculty and undergraduate students, and individual faculty autonomy are evident to some degree at all four-year institutions, but are easily recognized (and documented) as being elements of the culture and modus operandi of most research institutions *and* those that aspire to be research institutions.

It is important to note that there is an increasing amount of public debate and controversy about the place of research in today's institutions. Some of the central arguments are evident in the following two statements, and their content will shed light on issues discussed later in this chapter. The first is an explanation and defense of research priorities made by Virginia

Nordlin, a professor from the Department of Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Kentucky in a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

> I am disappointed with your editorial "Put Scholars Before Dollars," on April 12. The purpose of a university is not teaching; it is learning. Faculty members at outstanding universities learn by doing research, giving papers, attending conferences, and consulting in their field. They do this in order to help students learn. Recent discussions of higher education have omitted the students' duty to learn. . . . If students and parents give teaching a priority, let them spend their money at a small liberal arts college or a teaching university. (Nordlin, 1993, p. 20)

The second perspective is offered by Derek Bok, president emeritus of Harvard, in his keynote address to the American Higher Education Association in 1992, when he sought to explain why American universities have lost the support and trust of so many people in the Congress and the American public. After discounting several of the usual theories (e.g. rising costs, a conservative agenda), he focused on the research and teaching dichotomy and concluded that the problem has developed because "our leading universities are not making the education of students a top priority"—especially in the arts and science faculties.

> Although there are smaller colleges where teaching remains the overriding priority, in the modern university the incentives are not weighted in favor of teaching and education—indeed, quite the contrary is true. As we all know, the prizes, the media recognition, the extra income do not come from working with students or engaging in exemplary teaching. And it is not just the professors' incentives that are out of whack, but also those of administrators. What presidents and deans are held accountable for is improving the prestige of their institutions, and the prestige of their institutions comes from the research reputation of their faculties . . . and so administrators, too, often relegate the interests of undergraduates to the background. . . . When we go to recruit a starting professor, the bargaining chip is always a reduced teaching load—never a reduced research load. (pp. 15-17)

The central issue at UAF and other institutions is not whether a university really *is* a research university. What is important is that the research university model has historically set the standard for *all* higher education institutions (Bok, 1992), and UAF has chosen to judge itself by these standards. This model was central in shaping the climate that prevailed at UAF before the demographic and societal changes of the 1960s began to be felt (as described in the first four chapters), and it has continued to influence decisions made at UAF in response to issues of multiculturalism.

The Challenge of Multiculturalism In Higher Education

As anyone knows who follows the popular or professional press, the labels used to describe the variety of higher education definitions of diversity are frequently puzzling, confounding and numerous. This can be gleaned from a quick perusal of almost any university policy document, since nearly all of them include some reference to diversity, i.e. affirmative action, cross-cultural, discrimination, ethnicity, first amendment, freedom of speech, institutional racism, marginalization, minorities, multicultural, politically correct (PC), prejudice, quotas, racism, sexism, speech codes, under-served, and under-represented. And there continues to be confusion about the appropriate use of terms such as African American, Black, Hispanic, Mexican American, visible minorities and people-of-color. The common denominator in this confusing vocabulary is always "diversity," and the ensuing debates revolve around the question of whether or not people are advantaged or disadvantaged because of their differences. Efforts to describe, or to compare and contrast university students and programs, are further compounded by the differences in university structures and by significant differences in student populations due to geographic location.

The ambiguity of the vocabulary used in university contexts for identifying differences among people is evident from a review of the categories by which students are asked to identify themselves on UAF forms. The 1993 UAF "Undergraduate Application for Admission" form contains an assortment of options that the university believes evinces meaningful race and ethnic distinctions.

Race/Ethnicity (circle one):

White/Non-Hispanic
Alaska Native
Oriental
Black/Non-Hispanic
Alaskan Indian
Pacific Islander
Hispanic
Eskimo
Asian
American Indian
Aleut
Other

Though completion of this section of the form is optional, applicants are informed that "The following information is requested for us to demonstrate compliance with federal laws. This information is used for statistical purposes only."

In response to these choices, students frequently complain that there are no provisions for indicating their "bi-" or "multi-" backgrounds. They point out that the lack of options causes serious inaccuracies when statistics are compiled, and some have said that they resent being forced to place themselves in a single category when in fact they are of MULTIcultural, MULTIethnic or of MULTIracial heritage—and hence many simply choose to not complete this section. They also point out that several of the categories are ambiguous, i.e. how does one determine whether to circle "Alaska Native" or "Eskimo"? The often over-simplistic, erroneous and inappropriate vocabulary that we continue to use to discuss and examine issues related to cultural, ethnic and racial differences has caused a great deal of genuine misunderstanding and distraction in finding solutions.

The term that is emerging in both popular and professional literature as the umbrella term for describing this debate in higher education is "multiculturalism." Although multiculturalism has been used quite extensively in the past to describe and prescribe programs and policies in elementary and secondary school settings, its use in higher education literature is more recent. Although sometimes used broadly to describe a range of differences, it is most often used to refer to issues related to race, ethnicity, culture and language.

Multiculturalism appears to be more acceptable to a wider range of people than some of the terminology that has now become so emotionally laden that it evokes immediate positive or negative reactions (e.g. terms such as assimilation and melting pot). When reviewing the use of the term "pluralism" in higher education it appears as though it is the closest progenitor to what is implied by multiculturalism. Pluralism is most frequently defined and used to imply a climate in which people from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds are allowed and encouraged to retain characteristics of their particular groups (e.g. maintaining their own languages, social networks, residential enclaves, churches) while, at the same time, sharing some aspects of a common culture and participating individually and collectively in the larger society's economic and political life (Cashmore, 1984). In a melding of the terms, Spitzberg and Thorndike (1992) examine the notion of a campus policy of "cultural pluralism" in which the focus is upon the "reciprocity of understanding that the goal of cultural pluralism requires. . . [It] demands a commitment of all to study and understand each other. The distinction between the assimilationist ideal and pluralism is that the demand for self-transcendence is equally shared by majority and minority" (p. 49).

"MultiCULTURALism" does have the potential to be a more accurate and appropriate term for focusing on and examining differences, because it recognizes "culture" as being the most integral and central component of the diversity debate. It is one of the few terms available for talking about the deep and consequential kinds of differences that exist between and within groups of people, i.e. belief systems, communication patterns, styles of interaction, values, and interpersonal (gender and family) relationships. These characteristics are some of the most elusive and difficult to describe, and yet the most essential for defining who we are and who we want to be—and the ones that can cause the most difficulty at an individual or institutional level. Differences based on culture are the least documented, the most complex to understand, and frequently the most difficult to address. They represent the kinds of differences that cause the anxiety and anguish frequently referred to by minority students when they describe their struggle to live in two worlds.

The Challenge at UAF

In this section I examine the types of changes made at UAF in response to multiculturalism issues in general and, more specifically, the changes made to respond to Alaska Native and rural *issues,* and to Alaska Native and rural *students*, on the Fairbanks campus. An analysis of the changes makes it evident that the University of Alaska Fairbanks, like most other institutions, implemented the majority of its changes in response to the needs of people *from its own region* and like most institutions, a high percentage of its minority student population come from a single minority group.

At UAF, as on many campuses today, a contentious and unresolved area in the multicultural debate continues to be the issue of whether universities should develop programs for students from a single minority group (as opposed to developing single programs for all students regardless of ethnicity, or developing programs in which all minority students are regarded as a single group). With the exception of some national colleges and universities that draw students from many different regions of the United States, and whose admissions policies allow them to be quite selective, most colleges and universities serve people from their own region. As a result, they are likely to have a high percentage of minority students from a single group (e.g. Asian Americans, Blacks, Hispanics, or Native Americans) rather than an even distribution across multiple groups (Cass & Cass-Liepmann, 1994; Yarbrough, 1992; U.S. News & World Report, 1993). At UAF this is clearly the case with Alaska Natives representing approximately nine percent of students on the Fairbanks campus (and 14 percent of all students on UAF's Fairbanks and rural campuses), and Asian, Black and Hispanic students being just two percent each (UAF Fact Book, 1993; UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94).

Some of the issues involved in this debate are examined by Yarbrough (1992) who argues that no one strategy can be developed and applied universally "because the diverse cultures comprising American society are not equally distributed throughout the country," and therefore it is only reasonable, and appropriate, for colleges and universities to develop goals and strategies that are designed specifically for the recruitment and retention of students from the regions they serve (p. 66).

> [Even in the national institutions] it will be necessary for colleges to channel their efforts—so that one becomes a center for some groups, while another becomes a center for others. . . .[This] is not meant to imply that the smaller national colleges should limit their recruiting to only certain groups. It is rather to suggest that they should state very clearly to prospective students that cultural opportunities may be limited at the college, and that *if* these are a significant factor in the selection process (and they will not be for all students), the students would be better served to look elsewhere. . . . If the desired level of diversity is unrealistic, the result will inevitably be disappointing and potentially destructive of future efforts (p. 66-67).

Out of necessity, UAF did channel its efforts, and as a result, it has evolved as the state's center for the study of Alaska Native culture and languages, and as the institution with the highest number of Alaska Native four-year degree recipients.

The number of Alaska Native students studying on the Fairbanks campus has increased steadily in the past 25 years. Despite the fact that accurate enrollment figures have always been difficult to get (because reporting of race and ethnicity is optional, information gathering forms are ambiguous, and data that distinguishes between on- and off-campus students is frequently not available), a review of the number of students graduating can provide useful information on trends. From 1917 (when the university first offered classes) until 1960, there were a total of 12 Alaska Native graduates. Between 1961 and 1974 an additional 103 graduated from all three of the university's main campuses, a third of them in the first two graduating classes (1972 and 1974) of the *off-campus* teacher education program at UAF.

By assembling graduation data for Alaska Native students who completed the majority of their coursework just on the Fairbanks campus during the 15 year period from 1975 to 1990, it is evident that an increasing number of Native students are entering and completing their degree programs, but there are fairly significant fluctuations among the numbers and percentages of Native graduates each year. The number of Native graduates in all undergraduate degrees ranged from 5 students (in 1978 and 1984) to 42 students (in 1989) with the average number being 16. The percentage of Alaska Native graduates, relative to the total number of UAF students receiving baccalaureate degrees, ranged from 1 percent (in 1984) to 10 percent (in 1989), with the average being 5 percent over the 15 year period.

The upswing in the number of Alaska Native students pursuing postsecondary education began in the early 1970s fueled in part by federal initiatives previously examined (e.g. Civil Rights movement, Great Society programs, increase of federal funds), and in response to conditions specific to Alaska—the increase in the number of Alaska Native students graduating from high school and the increase in funding options available. As described in Chapter 4, the state accepted legal responsibility for providing high schools for students in over 120 rural villages in 1976, and the number of Alaska Native high school graduates has increased dramatically since that time. In addition, the availability of more financial student assistance—from federal sources (e.g. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pell Grant), state sources (e.g. the Alaska Student Loan Program and the Alaska Teacher Scholarship Program) and students' own Native corporations—have been other important variables in increasing the number of students who have been financially able to pursue a post-secondary education.

Many Alaska Native students chose to pursue their higher education by coming to study in Fairbanks which was the only residential campus at the time. As the Native enrollment increased in the 1970s and as Alaska Native issues assumed a more central position in the state's economic and political arenas, pressures began to mount on UAF to be more responsive to Native concerns if it expected to contribute to the broader needs of the state and to the needs of its changing student population.

The Changes at UAF: Alaska Native Programs, Student Services and Coursework

The University of Alaska Fairbanks has responded to the concerns of Alaska Native people in a variety of ways over the past 25 years by implementing new programs and services for students on the Fairbanks campus, as well as in rural communities. It is important to remember that most of the UAF programs and services provided to students in rural areas are *not* included in this research which focuses only on those that are available to students on the Fairbanks campus.

To provide the necessary context for understanding and interpreting the student data in Chapters 6 and 7, I have gathered information about programs and services that have been implemented at UAF in response to Alaska Native issues and Alaska Native students' interests and needs. Appendix A, *Alaska Native Programs and Student Services on Campus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks,* provides a comprehensive report of all of the Alaska Native programs and services currently available on campus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Although the term "rural" is central to understanding and interpreting Alaska Native cultural systems (as discussed in Chapter 4), for the sake of readability I do not always specify "Alaska Native *and* rural" when I refer to Alaska Native programs or services. In Alaska and at UAF the two are essentially synonymous, though there are non-native rural students as well.

In the report (Appendix A), I have included a narrative description for each of the 27 UAF programs and services that I identified as meeting the two criteria listed above, and I have included information on each of the variables listed below.

- Title of program or service
- Description of program or service
- Year program or service was initiated
- Current administrative unit in which program or service is housed
- Identification of who is eligible to participate in program or service
- Approximate percentage of participants who are Alaska Native or American Indian
- Original and primary source of funding

The majority of the information in this report came from publicly available written descriptions of programs, services and courses, supplemented by clarification from people directly involved.

Using the categories identified in a national survey of higher education responses to multiculturalism, I have organized my review of UAF's responses to Alaska Native students and issues into five major sections: (1) Alaska Native departments, programs and academic courses; (2) general education requirements; (3) Alaska Native faculty; (4) Alaska Native research institutes and faculty development; and (5) Alaska Native advising and academic support programs. Within each of the sections I include the following: a summary statement from a national survey about the types of changes made by other colleges and universities relative to this item; information about specific programs, policies, services or courses at UAF; and a discussion of the data.

The national survey I draw from was conducted by the editors of the higher education publication, Change in 1991 when they surveyed 196 colleges and universities to determine "the condition of multiculturalism on campus" (Levine & Cureton, 1992, pp. 25-29). Using a broad definition of multiculturalism, they sent a questionnaire to a random sample of 270 colleges and universities that had been stratified by Carnegie type to insure that the sample would be representative of all types of American higher education institutions. Although the survey was intended to focus on curriculum issues, it is evident that the findings extend beyond this because of the difficulty of gaining an accurate understanding of a campus climate without a holistic perspective. I have included this information to provide a framework for examining the range of responses to multiculturalism and to provide a yardstick for determining how UAF's efforts compare to those of other institutions.

Alaska Native Departments, Programs and Academic Coursework

According to the Change survey, more than half (54 percent) of all colleges and universities have introduced "multiculturalism" into their departmental course offerings. The leading departments have been English and history, and the most common approach has been to add new materials to existing courses. More than a third of all colleges and universities offer classes in African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic-American and Native American studies, though formal departments and programs in these areas are less common (Levine & Cureton, 1992).

At UAF, the academic structure (i.e. the development of departments and programs), as well as course offerings has changed over the past 25 years. Table 1 provides a list of the departments, programs and special academic activities that have been designed in response to Alaska Native issues, and Native students' interests and needs.

Table 1

UAF Departments, Programs and Special Academic Activities With an Alaska Native Focus

Title of Program or Service	Description	Current UAF Unit	Year Initiated
Alaska Native Leadership Seminars	Public Seminar/ Academic Course	Department of Alaska Native Studies	1983
College of Rural Alaska	Academic/ Administrative Unit	UAF	1987
Department of Alaska Native Languages	Academic Department	College of Liberal Arts	1972
Department of Alaska Native Studies	Academic Department	College of Liberal Arts	1981
Department of Rural Development	Academic Department	College of Rural Alaska	1983
Festival of Native Arts	Student Activity/ Academic Course	Department of Alaska Native Studies	1973
Native Elder-in-Residence Program	Student Activity/ Academic Course	Department of Alaska Native Studies	1983
Orientation to Alaska Native Education Seminars	Public Seminar/ Academic Course	School of Education	1988
Rural Student Teaching Option	Rural Placement Program	School of Education	1982
TUMA Theater	Student Activity/ Academic Course	Department of Alaska Native Studies	1978
* Information on specific Alaska Native/rural courses is included in Table 2			

As indicated earlier, UAF's most substantive response to issues of diversity (or multiculturalism) is reflected in its development of new academic departments, programs, degrees and courses that focus on *Alaska Native and/or rural issues*. The administrative structures that have been developed to coordinate these academic efforts at UAF include the Department of Rural Development and the College of Rural Alaska, as well as the Departments of Alaska Native Languages and Alaska Native Studies.

The College of Rural Alaska was established in 1987 and evolved directly from the College of Human and Rural Development (CHRD) which was established in 1983. The CHRD administrative structure was designed to consolidate university services for rural and Native students, and it included most of the UAF departments that had responsibility for preparing students to work in human service-oriented positions in both rural and urban

Alaska: education, psychology, rural development, sociology, and social work. Since 1992, after a third restructuring effort, the College of Rural Alaska has been recast as the primary administrative structure for pre-college, certificate and two-year associate degree programs, with the Department of Rural Development the only remaining four-year degree program; all others have been moved back to the College of Liberal Arts.

Two academic departments in the College of Liberal Arts focus specifically on Alaska Native issues and both offer four-year degree programs. The Department of Alaska Native Languages offers coursework and degrees in Alaska Native languages, and the Department of Alaska Native Studies offers coursework, and a degree, in a variety of subjects related to Alaska Native interests.

In addition to identifying programs and services at the structural level, I also compiled a list of the regularly-offered undergraduate academic courses that had "Alaska Native" and/or "rural" in the course title or description in the UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94. (I did not include courses that were listed as being offered on an "As Demand Warrants" basis). There were 78 courses that met these criteria—six percent of the 1,273 regularly-offered undergraduate courses. Appendix B is a list of these courses and the academic unit in which they are offered. There are of course, other courses offered on the Fairbanks campus that likely incorporate information about Alaska Native and/or rural issues, but if such information is not included in the catalog, it is dependent on the interest of the individual instructor. Therefore I could not include them here.

The three departments whose specific focus is Alaska Native or rural issues (i.e. Departments of Alaska Native Languages, Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development) offer the majority of these courses. Some UAF departments contribute by collaborating with these three to offer cross-listed courses, while others offer their own courses with an Alaska Native/rural emphasis. The 78 courses are taught by approximately 30 different faculty members, out of a total UAF faculty of 717 (193 of whom are employed part-time).

The Department of Alaska Native Studies (ANS) provides one-third of the 78 Alaska Native/rural focus courses—11 of its own and 16 that are cross-listed with a co-sponsoring academic department. Table 2 includes information about the regularly scheduled Alaska Native/rural courses offered by each academic department at UAF and indicates which of these are cross-listed. The cross-listing arrangement has been designed to encourage involvement in, and responsibility for, Alaska Native and rural curricula by faculty in other academic departments. In addition, it offers the students an opportunity to take courses for credit in either department, with the extra *legitimacy* provided by the label of a traditional discipline for a non-traditional course.

Table 2

UAF Academic Course Offerings With An Alaska Native and/or Rural Focus

Academic Department	Number of Alaska Native and Rural Courses	Number of Cross-Listed Courses
Alaska Native Languages	17	
Alaska Native Studies	11	(16)
Anthropology	6	1
Art		6
Cross-Cultural Communications	1	
Education	4	1
English		2
History	3	
Justice	1	
Music	1	
Political Science	1	3
Psychology	2	
Rural Development	10	1
Social Work	3	
Sociology	2	
Theater		2

In addition to content oriented coursework, some Alaska Native Studies courses provide students with the option to participate in a variety of Alaska Native traditional and contemporary activities on a volunteer basis. Examples of these "student activity/academic course" options include the Alaska Native Leadership seminars, the Festival of Native Arts, TUMA Theater, and the Native Elder-in-Residence Program. The School of Education's rural placement program (that allows all students the option of doing their student teaching in rural, Alaska Native communities), and its "Orientation to Alaska Native Education" seminars are two other options that provide academic credit for opportunities to focus on Alaska Native and rural issues.

Eighty-five percent of the Alaska Native/rural academic courses are offered through departments that are now located in one college—the College of Liberal Arts. Although this offers the potential for collaborative efforts, it also means that the predisposition of a single administrator can have a great deal of impact. In addition, it indicates that other academic units are not as directly responsible or involved in Alaska Native or rural efforts. While a large number of Native students come to UAF with an interest in degree programs in business, economics or natural resources, rising out of needs associated with the Native regional and village corporations, little is offered in those departments that speaks directly to their interests. In most cases, these students now choose to seek their degrees from the Department of Rural Development because it offers business, economic and natural resources options with a rural and Alaska Native orientation.

The courses, programs and academic activities described here are available to all students, and while the number of non-Native students participating in these courses remains steady, the Native enrollment continues to grow. In 1993, approximately 40 percent of the students minoring in Alaska Native Studies were non-Native students.

General Multicultural Course Requirements

The national Change survey reports that more than a third (34 percent) of all colleges and universities have a multicultural general education requirement. While some focus on domestic diversity (12 percent), more emphasize global multiculturalism (29 percent), and most include both (57 percent). The programs vary in structure. Some (13 percent) might be called core curricula, meaning all students take the same courses. Others (68 percent) could be identified as prescribed electives because students are permitted to choose from a relatively short list of approved courses, and the remainder (19 percent) include a variety of electives from various disciplines (Levine & Cureton, 1992).

The survey indicates many colleges and universities now *require* students to take courses that have a multicultural focus. When the students who participated in this study attended UAF, no courses with a multicultural emphasis were required. The requirements for all students were two specific English composition courses and a speech course (for a total of 9 credits), 7 science credits, 6 math/logic credits, and a minimum of 15 humanities and social studies credits. Beyond these general requirements, each department and major area of study determined its own requirements.

In 1990, however, UAF implemented a core curriculum which *all* students must complete regardless of their choice of major or their career aspirations. The core requirements now include the same 9 credits of English composition and speech, 3 math credits, and 8 natural science credits. In addition, students are required to complete 18 credits in specified humanities and social science courses that have been assembled under the theme "Perspectives on the Human Condition." Based on a review of the "Perspective" course descriptions, it is evident that all UAF students are now required to take three courses (9 credits) that include a focus on broad issues of diversity or multiculturalism. Students do have the option of satisfying 6 of the 18 credits of this core requirement by completing two semester-length courses in a single Alaska Native language (or other non-English language) and substituting these courses for two of the prescribed human perspectives courses. This is an important option because it allows students to use the study of an Alaska Native (i.e. a minority and non-traditional) language to satisfy 6 credits of core requirements. There are, however, no other instances in the descriptions of *any* of the core courses where the terms Alaska, Alaska Native, or rural are found.

There are a limited number of majors that do require coursework relating to Alaska Native issues. Those that call for several courses include the obvious majors in Alaska Native Studies, Inupiaq Language, Northern Studies (an interdisciplinary degree), Rural

Development, and Yup'ik Language. Students seeking a degree in education, psychology, social work and sociology are required to take "Native Cultures of Alaska" (Anth 242). There are no other majors that require courses that include a reference to Alaska Native issues.

In addition to courses with an Alaska Native and rural focus there are additional courses at UAF that incorporate a cross-cultural or multicultural perspective. On the basis of an informal review of course titles and descriptions in the UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94, it appears as though the departments of education, psychology and sociology have been the primary initiators of coursework that incorporates general—but not specifically Alaskan—multicultural or cross-cultural issues and perspectives.

Alaska Native Faculty

According to the Change survey, a majority of colleges and universities in the United States are seeking to increase faculty diversity, and recruitment is the chief mechanism. More than one-third of all institutions have an active program to attract under-represented faculty to their campuses. The survey reported a great deal of variation in the ways schools are going about this agenda (e.g. faculty mentor programs to support minority junior faculty, "grow-your-own" policies, recruitment of "ABD" minorities on probationary status, use of numerical guidelines and triggers, and requirement of mandatory reviews of appointment processes failing to turn up minorities), (Levine & Cureton, 1992).

Table 3 provides information on the distribution of Alaska Native and other Native American full-time faculty at UAF. The figures include information about faculty members on both the Fairbanks and the rural campuses.

Table 3

UAF Alaska Native and Other Native American Full-Time Faculty Distribution by Academic Unit, 1992

College or School Department	Alaska Native: Fairbanks Campus	Alaska Native: Rural Campuses	Other Native American: Fairbanks Campus	Total UAF Faculty
College of Liberal Arts				
Alaska Native Languages	1			6
Alaska Native Studies			1	3
Art	1		1	8
Behavioral Sciences			1	13
School of Education	2	3		22
Philosophy			1	5
Speech Communication			1	7
College of Rural Alaska				
Interior Campus		2		5
Kuskokwim Campus		5		16
School of Engineering	1			28
School of Fisheries & Ocean Science		1		46
All Other Academic Units	0	0	0	365
UAF Total	5	11	5	524

Source: UAF Fact Book, 1993

There were 21 full-time Native American faculty at UAF in 1992. This represented four percent of the total number of full-time UAF faculty. Ten of these faculty members had positions on the Fairbanks campus; 5 were Alaska Natives, and 5 were Native Americans with tribal affiliations outside Alaska. Approximately one-half of the group of 21 were in tenure-track positions, and most of these held the rank of assistant professor. Other minority full-time faculty at UAF included 18 Asian-Americans, 3 African-Americans, 3 Hispanics, and 47 who were classified as "non-resident aliens" (UAF Fact Book, 1993). A review of UAF policies and practices suggests that efforts to increase faculty diversity have been made more in recruitment rather than in retention. By June of 1994, 5 of the Alaska Native or other Native American faculty members had left UAF.

Alaska Native Research Institutes and Faculty Development

Nationally, more than a third (35 percent) of all colleges and universities have established institutes whose purpose includes the provision of "homes" for faculty research on multicultural issues. At UAF there are two research and development institutes designed to support and house faculty research related to multicultural issues. The Alaska Native Language Center was established in 1972 by the Alaska Legislature to research and document Native languages, prepare school materials and increase public understanding of Alaska Native language issues. The other research unit, the Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, was organized in 1976, and serves as "the research and development unit of the School of Education. [It] addresses educational issues and problems inherent in Alaska's multicultural population. The Center administers instructional support, contracts and grants for the school, and issues publications and reports designed to improve cross-cultural understanding" (Appendix A).

Another step taken by institutions in response to issues of diversity has occurred in the area of faculty development. The Change study reports that 42 percent of the surveyed institutions have programs to support faculty through some combination of research, study leaves, course development, and campus workshops related to multiculturalism. Another 22 percent include multiculturalism as one option from which faculty can choose within their more general faculty development portfolios (Levine & Cureton, 1992).

Examples of these kinds of recent efforts at UAF include a travel program for faculty and a seminar for faculty and administrators. In 1979 funding was received from the Mellon Foundation that allowed new faculty on the Fairbanks campus to travel to rural communities as part of an orientation to rural and Native issues. In 1992, a special one-day seminar was organized to bring some Fairbanks faculty members and administrators together to explore ideas for "overcoming barriers to more effective education for Native students at UAF" (From the Chancellor, 1992). The seminar was facilitated by two invited Alaska Native educators, and the intention was that subsequent plans for improving Native education would be prepared by individual UAF units. Although these kinds of programs do help to provide faculty with an awareness of multicultural issues, their effectiveness is limited unless they are offered on a regular basis.

Alaska Native Advising and Student Support Programs

The Change survey reports that half of all colleges and universities have multicultural advising programs. These programs focus on personal, social, financial, academic, and career advising. They make use of the services of faculty, professional counselors, peers and members of the external community. They take place on- and off-campus, in freshman seminars, residence halls, workshops, classes, and campus media of all types and descriptions. More than a third have specific centers that provide support for multicultural students, including what Levine and Cureton (1992) describe as "a grab bag of activities" (p. 27).

Table 4 includes information on 12 advising and student support programs and services at UAF that have been designed to respond to the interests and needs of Alaska Native students.

Table 4

UAF Alaska Native Advising and Student Support Programs on Campus at UAF

Title of Program or Service	Description	UAF Administrative Unit	Year Initiated
AISES: American Indian Science/Engineering Society	Academic Club	Rural Student Services	1989
ANESA: Alaska Native Education Student Association	Academic Club	School of Education	1988
Alaska Native Student Social Workers Association	Academic Club	Social Work Department	1989
CCC: Cross-Cultural Communications Program	Academic Preparation	College of Liberal Arts	1975
NANA House and Proposed Doyon House	Residential Option	Northwest Arctic Native Association/Student Services	1984
NSO: Native Student Organization	Special Interest Club	Rural Student Services	1960s
RSS: Rural Student Services	Comprehensive Advising	Office of Student Services	1969
RAHI: Rural Alaska Honors Institute	High School Bridging Program	Department of Alaska Native Studies	1983
Recruitment of Rural High School Students	Rural Recruitment	Rural Student Services/ Admissions Office	1980
Student Support Services Program	Tutoring/Special Courses	Cross-Cultural Communications Program	1975
Upward Bound	High School Bridging Program	Office of Student Services	1967
Writing Center Services in RSS	Academic Support	Department of English	1991

UAF has adopted a potpourri of programs and services that are referred to in the Change survey as "support" programs and/or "advising" programs. Although participation in all but one (NANA House) of these programs and services is open to students from any cultural or ethnic group, the program descriptions and data indicate that most have been designed specifically to respond to the needs of Alaska Native and/or rural students, and Alaska Native students do utilize these services more than do students from other groups. (Since the NANA House is funded by the NANA regional Native corporation, student participation is restricted to students from the NANA area.)

I have organized the 12 programs in this section into five categories for the purposes of discussion: (1) bridging programs for high school students; (2) special housing options; (3) developmental classes and tutoring services; (4) student academic clubs; and (5) comprehensive advising services.

1. Bridging Programs for High School Students.

Two programs at UAF are intended to help high school students "bridge" the gap between high school and post secondary education. Upward Bound is a federally funded national program that began at UAF in 1967, and the Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI) is a university funded program that began in 1982. Both sponsor annual summer sessions in which high school students (between 40 and 60 students per program) come to Fairbanks, live on the campus for a six to eight week period, and participate in a variety of academic and social activities designed to prepare them for success in a university setting. Over 95 percent of the participants are Alaska Native students, and nearly all are from rural areas of the state. In addition to these preparatory programs, personnel from Rural Student Services (and occasionally from the Office of Admissions and Records) travel to rural communities to acquaint students with UAF programs and services in an effort to recruit more students from these areas to attend the university.

2. Special Housing Options.

UAF, like many other institutions, provides an alternative housing arrangement for some of its students on the basis of special interests. Since 1984 the NANA House has existed at UAF as a result of a collaborative agreement among UAF, the Northwest Arctic Borough School District, and the NANA Regional Corporation (Northwest Arctic Native Association— one of the 12 Alaska Native regional for-profit corporations). NANA House provides a special living and learning environment for Inupiaq Eskimo students from the NANA area in Northwest Alaska. It provides the support and strategies necessary to help students draw on their culture to succeed in college. Students are encouraged to "maintain ties to the people and values of their home regions" (Appendix A). Doyon, the Native regional for-profit corporation for the Interior, is hoping to establish a similar residential facility for Athabaskan students. They have already raised a significant amount of money toward building this facility, which they hope will help to ease the "transition into college life and improve students' chances for success in school" (Appendix A).

3. Special Preparatory Classes and Tutoring Services.

A third category of multicultural services includes special preparatory classes and tutoring services. There are several developmental and entry-level courses and tutoring services at UAF that have been designed specifically for Alaska Native and rural students. Some of the courses, such as "University Communications" (CCC 104) and "Intensive Reading Development" (CCC 105) are offered through the Cross-Cultural Communications Program which was developed to "serve the needs of Alaska Native and rural students. . . [in recognition of the fact that] the transition to university communication patterns presents challenges which vary in type as well as degree, depending on a student's cultural background." (Appendix A). Associated with the Cross-Cultural Communications Program is the Student Support Services Program (SSSP) which is a federally funded TRIO grant program designed to improve student retention and success rate. (TRIO programs were set up by the federal government in the 1960s to provide assistance, support and encouragement to low-income and first generation college students to allow them to continue their education beyond high school.) To qualify for tutoring or other forms of assistance through SSSP, students must demonstrate that they are a first generation college student, financially disadvantaged, and academically unprepared. Between 80 and 85 percent of the SSSP participants at UAF are Alaska Native students, and according to the program's brochure an effort has been made to design programs that will specifically meet the needs of Alaska Native students.

4. Student Academic Clubs.

Other forms of support available to students are specific student organizations that directly and indirectly provide advising and support for Alaska Native students. In three of these clubs students are involved in activities that are directly related to their major field of study: American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES), Alaska Native Education Student Association (ANESA), and Alaska Native Student Social Work Association. The Native Student Organization (NSO) coordinates a variety of Alaska Native oriented activities.

5. Comprehensive Advising Services.

Rural Student Services (RSS) has become the most comprehensive and the most visible service for Alaska Native students on the Fairbanks Campus of UAF. This program originated in 1969 as "Student Orientation Services," became Rural Student Services (RSS) in 1981, and was developed to meet the interests and needs of Alaska Native and rural students. (The BIA-supported demonstration project, "College Orientation Program for Alaska Natives/COPAN" [Salisbury, 1967] was available for a limited number of Native students from 1964 to 1967.)

Rural Student Services has evolved into a genuinely *comprehensive* program because it provides several different types of advising support (i.e. academic, career, financial, personal, social) to approximately 90 percent of Alaska Native students at UAF (Choulnard, 1994).

> In addition to its hallmark advising and coordination functions, RSS provides a vital link between the rural communities and Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAAs) and the University. While RSS works in cooperation with other UAF departments and programs, it also strengthens the traditions of UAF's Native students by offering a forum for Native concerns, a gathering place for potlucks and by working closely with Alaska Native Studies Elders-in-Residence Program. RSS is more than just a department or offices; it is also a place for creating a cultural partnership in Alaska higher education. (Appendix A).

RSS also serves, unofficially, in a coordinating and clearinghouse role among students and personnel involved in the four categories of programs and services already described.

Although a campus-wide Academic Advising Center was established at UAF in 1989 to fill an important gap by providing academic advising to all students who have not yet declared a major, few Alaska Native students use the services of the center because its advisors are not in a position to provide the more comprehensive services that are available at RSS. All full-time UAF students are also eligible to use the services of the Center for Health and Counseling. Some Alaska Native students meet with counselors at this center—particularly when crisis intervention counseling or extended therapy-oriented services are called for.

The criteria for involvement in most of the advising and student support services described here is not ethnic or cultural, but rather whether or not students qualify on the basis of some combination of rural, first generation, low income, or inadequate academic preparation. The term "rural" is often used as a code word for Alaska Native students in the titles and descriptions of advising and support services, more so than in other categories of programs. Sometimes this is done for legal reasons (i.e. some programs cannot be identified as serving students solely on the basis of race) and in some cases it is done for political considerations (i.e. a program is less apt to be labeled as discriminatory if the basis of inclusion is geographic rather than racial or ethnic).

Alaska Native Advisory Councils

In an effort to increase communication between minority communities and administrators, an increasing number of colleges and universities are establishing advisory councils that include community and campus representatives. UAF has two boards designed to advise UAF administration officials on multicultural issues related to Alaska Native and rural programs and policies. The College of Rural Alaska Community Council was established in 1988 for the following reasons.

> In recognition of the importance of citizen involvement in the planning, budgeting, and implementation of higher education programs and services for the State of Alaska, the Board of Regents hereby establishes a College of Rural Alaska Council. The Council shall share governance authority with the Dean in the areas of major program change, annual and long-term planning. As well, the selection and retention of the Dean shall be a joint concurrence process between the Council and the Chancellor. In addition, the Council shall provide guidance and direction to the College while serving as a link of the University's constituencies to the Board of Regents. (Appendix A)

The second advisory committee is the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Native Education. This committee was established in 1992 by the UAF chancellor following a controversy surrounding a statement made by a faculty member (in 1991) about the grading of Native students at UAF. The chancellor appointed a committee of students, faculty and community representatives "to advise me on Native educational issues and the role that UAF might take in addressing those issues" (Appendix A). Although advisory committees were not mentioned specifically in the Change survey, it is evident through reviews of catalogs and brochures that an increasing number of colleges and universities are utilizing advisory councils in order to develop collaborative and cooperative efforts between universities and the communities they serve.

Comments

The review of the initiatives on the Fairbanks campus makes it evident that issues of multiculturalism have prompted action and substantial changes in policy and practice for some units. The response has been uneven though, with several units responding only at the level of rhetoric and debate. If one looks closely at the contributors to the above programs and services, it becomes apparent that many of the same small units (and according to course registration schedules many of the same faculty) are involved in, and responsible for, most of the 27 programs. So while the list is impressive and something that UAF can take pride in, the skewed level of involvement should also prompt administrators and departments to search collectively for ways to promote and assure a meaningful involvement from a much wider cross-section of the UAF campus community without diminishing the efforts already underway.

Catalysts for Change at UAF

In the culture of research universities, the highest values and highest rewards for the institution—and for individual faculty members—come from research and from work with graduate students. However, in community colleges, in many liberal arts colleges, and in some comprehensive universities (depending on their geographical location and their student population), the campus cultures have traditionally placed a high value on teaching, advising, and other student-related work. The "default operating modes" of these kinds of colleges and universities are such that, when minority students show up on their campuses, they are able to modify and adapt quite readily because their priorities are student-centered. They already have traditions of strong student support services; faculty/student interaction at an undergraduate level; institutional rewards for teaching as well as research; and frequently there is greater collaboration among faculty than is possible in a competitive research university setting. Therefore, many universities with a research focus are required to make more modifications to respond to new groups of students than some other types of institutions. UAF's responses clearly reflect the national trends of research universities, and nearly every program and service described above has evolved in just the past 25 years.

Having reviewed the initiatives outlined above, I now examine some of the reasons *why* UAF made the choices it did in responding to the presence of an increasing number of Alaska Native students at the university, and to Alaska Native issues in general. I have organized these into two primary categories: responses to stimulus and pressure from *outside* the university; and *internal* accommodations to diverse student needs.

Responses to Pressures from Outside the University

Several of the conditions that led to the development of Alaska Native programs on the Fairbanks campus of UAF in the 1970s and early 1980s were very similar to those that led to changes in other universities in the United States. As described in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the Civil Rights Movement and the Great Society programs that developed during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations of the 1960s created a climate in which it became increasingly difficult to ignore the inequalities that existed for people who belonged to particular racial, ethnic or cultural groups in the United States. The increased focus on the social and economic conditions of all citizens provided data that served to propel Alaska into a national limelight. Quality-of-life indicators such as life expectancy, health, employment, and education for

Alaska Native people were not only among the lowest in the United States, but in some areas were far more akin to those of people in Third World countries than other United States citizens (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; U.S. Senate, 1969). The publicized chasm between the living conditions of Native and non-Native people brought an increase in federal assistance.

Concurrently, in the late 1960s, oil was discovered on Alaska's North Slope and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) was enacted by the United States Congress in 1971. This was a critical juncture in Alaska's history because the state's coffers increased dramatically, and for the first time Native people had a share of the state's money, land, and power. The Alaska Federation of Natives, in conjunction with the newly established profit-making and non-profit corporations, and the increasingly influential members of the "Bush Caucus" (a group of Alaska Native and rural legislators) helped to bring about a shift in economic and political power within the state, and provided Alaska Native people with leverage for negotiations that had not previously been available to them. When these groups defined their priorities, state institutions were far more likely to respond than they had previously, and in Alaska, just as in the national scene, public education was identified as a primary arena to begin to address many of the several long standing and severe inequities.

Despite increased awareness of the considerable differences in the economic and social conditions of Alaska Native and non-Native people, despite the fact that Alaska Native people had gained status in the financial and political arenas of Alaska, and despite the fact that there were documented inequalities in educational opportunities for Alaska Native people, Alaska's state university system and its public schools maintained a reactive, rather than a proactive, posture in terms of initiating changes that would address the interests and needs of Alaska Native people. Many of the most significant changes in education occurred because of actions initiated by groups *outside* the public schools or higher education institutions at both the national level (e.g. Brown v. the Board of Education, 1964 Civil Rights Act, the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, federal bilingual legislation, laws and statutes related to gender equity), and the state level (e.g. decentralization and local control options through the creation of 21 rural school districts, provision of village secondary schooling resulting from settlement of the Molly Hootch case). In higher education, the influences were sometimes less direct, but many of the programs and policies designed to respond to minority students were indeed shaped by outside factors. Within the University of Alaska system, it is evident that the impetus, and in several instances the funding, for most Alaska Native programs and services came from sources outside the university, particularly from federal and state legislative initiatives and from grassroots movements within the state.

UAF's cautious and conservative response to new groups of students and to the new political environment, and its reliance upon federal and state initiatives for programs serving minority students, was similar to that of many other institutions of higher education. Richard Richardson's work with the Education Commission of the States (ECS) provides an examination of the variety of ways in which colleges and universities have been, and continue to be, influenced by the actions of both *federal* and *state* agencies (1990).

The federal government has influenced higher education primarily through its support of: (1) individual students through the Pell Grant funding program, (2) the TRIO programs for students who meet federal criteria, (3) the collection and reporting of state and national statistics on minority participation in higher education, and (4) research related to minority participation. The federally funded programs at UAF—in particular, the math and communication courses administered through the Student Support Services Program (SSSP) and the Cross-Cultural Communications Program (CCC)—have served as an important component of UAF's services for Alaska Native students. In addition, over 1,000 Alaska Native high school students have been served by Upward Bound, another federally funded TRIO program, since it began in 1967. Nearly all Alaska Native university students have also qualified for, and benefited from, moneys available through the federally funded Pell Grant program.

Support (or the lack of it) at a state level is also an important variable, and is evident primarily through the actions of governors' offices, legislatures, and official state boards. The

Education Commission of the States (ECS) has documented and described significant variation among states regarding the level of financial and political support they provide for the goal of "increasing minority participation" in their higher education systems. In Alaska, the state legislature did play a pivotal role in helping to establish some of the major Alaska Native programs and services at UAF through "legislative intent" that provided line-item funding for programs that served Alaska Native people. At least seven of UAF's programs and services (Alaska Native Language Center (ANLC), Alaska Native Language Department, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI), Student Orientation Services (SOS/RSS), and Alaska Native Studies Department programs such as the elders-in-residence and the leadership seminars) were initiated by the legislature, indicating a strong political commitment at the state level.

Richardson, in several of his research reports for ECS (e.g. 1989, 1990, 1991) emphasizes that a state's "climate for minorities" is an important factor for minority success. In a state like Alaska where there is only one public system of higher education this would seem to be an especially important variable. It is irrefutable that the initiative and the financial support provided by the Alaska Legislature in the late 1970s and early 1980s was a critical factor in the development of UAF programs for Alaska Native students. Included in all of Richardson's reports, though, are strong and convincing arguments that federal and state government aid should not in any way absolve individual institutions from their "paramount responsibility" for increasing minority participation and success. His research argument is that, although universities need support from the federal and state governments, minority programs and services must always be an integral part of the *institutional* budget and priorities.

In addition to federal and state governments, a third category of external groups influences university decisions. Palmer (1992) refers to these as "movement" groups—grassroots organizations not directly affiliated with federal or state governments. External pressure from these groups—especially for changes that are perceived by many within the system as radical, subversive, unconstitutional or a threat to the traditional culture—represents some of the most interesting, but least documented and understood reasons for change in university systems. The inclusion of Women's Studies and Black Studies in university programs, and the inclusion of provisions for handicapped students; came about primarily through stimulus from non-government groups outside of academia (e.g. the Woman's Movement and the Civil Rights Movement).

In Alaska, the Alaska Federation of Natives and the profit-making and non-profit regional corporations have been some of the most influential "movement" groups. In collaboration with the Bush Caucus, their efforts frequently have been responsible for generating support from the legislature for the development of programs and services for Alaska Native people. In addition to the programs previously described that were initiated by legislative intent, others such as the Department of Alaska Native Studies, the Department of Rural Development and the College of Rural Alaska developed as a result of several years of continued pressure by the Alaska Native community.

While the posture of the institution as a whole has been reactive rather than proactive there certainly have always been a number of faculty, student service personnel and student groups who have initiated and actively garnered support for Alaska Native programs and services. These individuals recognized internal shortcomings and sometimes appealed to movement groups or other external sources for assistance because they felt their arguments would be represented (and heard) by these organizations.

Palmer (1992) suggests that we must pay attention to the impact of groups outside of state and federal agencies if we want to understand more about how and why changes do or do not occur within university systems. He examines the changes that are prompted by those on the periphery, i.e. "the movement approaches," and compares them to the typical "organizational approaches" that are more frequently used in higher education.

> The organizational approach to change is premised on the notion that bureaucracies—their rules, roles, and relationships—define the limits of social reality within which change must happen. Organizations are essentially arrangements of power, so this approach to change asks: "how can the power contained within the boxes of this

> organization be rearranged or redirected to achieve the desired goal?" That is a good question—except when it assumes that bureaucracies are the only game in town.
>
> I began to understand movements when I saw the simple fact that nothing would ever have changed if reformers had allowed themselves to be done in by organizational resistance. . . . The movement mentality, far from being defeated by organizational resistance, takes energy from opposition. Opposition validates the audacious idea that change must come. (pp. 10, 12)

It is likely that Alaska Native leaders and their supporters did garner some of their energy from the direct or indirect opposition of the university and this too may be an important factor in understanding how and why Alaska Native programs evolved on the UAF campus. In many ways the efforts and results of these groups parallel those of non-governmental organizations, or "NGOs," in international third-world efforts for change. It is clear that without the direction of the federal programs and the moneys they brought, without the specific direction and sometimes special funding of the State legislature, and without the pressure brought by grassroots movement groups, programs and policies for Alaska Natives would be less evident at UAF than they are today.

Accommodations to Pressures from Within the University

The pressure from groups external to the university was an important factor in the change process, as was the immediate need to respond to the interests and needs of the growing number of Native students on the Fairbanks campus. Another factor, however, that was equally important in determining whether or not UAF would initiate and support a new program, service or curricular change was whether the change would interfere in any significant way with the university's ability to maintain and develop its research university identity. It is apparent that many changes were acceptable only if *no trade-offs,* that would impact the internally-defined research mission, were required.

The addition of most Alaska Native programs and services has not caused a serious displacement of existing programs or policies because so many of them were financial *and* organizational "add-ons." During the early pipeline years there was enough state money to support the addition of several new Alaska Native programs, and federal funds were available to allow for the development of other programs for minority students. With the exception of the statewide university reorganization in 1987 (when UAF was given responsibility for nearly all of the rural campuses and sites as well as the Fairbanks campus), the addition of most Alaska Native programs and services did not require major adjustments in university priorities or structures. Since many of the programs were situated in either the Office of Student Services or in one or two of UAF's colleges, they did not cause a major disruption to the way in which most university personnel continued to lead their daily academic lives.

The characteristics that define, and the priorities that are essential to, a research university were not threatened by the addition of most Alaska Native programs, student services and curricular changes. Since funding was available and only minimal involvement was required from many members of the UAF community, the addition and presence of Alaska Native programs and services did not cause a significant rearrangement of what Palmer (1992) describes as the power contained within the boxes of the organization. Evidence for this comes from examining some of the specific changes made in two primary areas: student support services and the curriculum.

In nearly all United States higher education institutions, the first response to multiculturalism has been the development of some type of minority student support service. This was true at UAF where the first major programs designed specifically for Alaska Native students were Upward Bound and the Student Orientation Services. Today at least 12 services on the Fairbanks campus provide academic support for minority students (e.g. student clubs, comprehensive advising services, developmental courses, high school bridging programs, residential options, tutorial services). In addition to providing support services to minority students, these programs share other characteristics with their national counterparts: those that are not federally funded operate on relatively small budgets; they have little status, clout or influence within the wider system; many of the same people are often responsible for several different programs or services; and, because of the reward system in research universities, there is little incentive for involvement or participation by academic faculty.

Despite their existence on the periphery, student support services are the programs that most institutions, including UAF, choose to present to the general public through the media, as evidence of their responsiveness to minority students. Institutions seldom have to alter their modus operandi when they incorporate minority student support services because their survival is often dependent on "the commitment and tenacity of staff and friends" as Tijerina and Biemer (1987/1988) observed after they studied many Native American college and university programs.

A second area of response to multiculturalism relates to curricular changes. Although many Alaska Native and rural courses have been implemented, and although the list of Alaska Native and rural courses is impressive, there are other factors to consider in evaluating the impact of curricular change on the UAF community. In this arena, just as in student support services, it is evident that the overall modus operandi of UAF has not been significantly altered by the addition of new degrees or courses.

As we have seen, the University of Alaska Fairbanks responded to Alaska Native people and to the multicultural debate in terms of actual course changes in a variety of ways. New courses were designed and old ones were modified to include a focus on *multicultural* issues, and a small number of these became required courses. Another UAF response has been to develop courses that focus explicitly on *Alaska Native* issues, and an even smaller number of these have been required. The first approach, i.e. adding a multicultural or cross-cultural perspective, has been, perhaps, the most judicious response because it appeased administrators and faculty who argued that a "generic" multicultural approach was the only appropriate curricular response, as well as those who argued that an Alaska Native perspective should also be included in all courses that had a multicultural focus. Because of the latitude and autonomy granted to faculty members, those who teach courses that include "multicultural" or "cross-cultural" in the title or course description can use their own judgment to determine whether the multicultural perspective will be a central or marginal component of the course. And, they also have the option of including or not including Alaska Native issues as part of the larger multicultural perspective. Their decisions have depended upon the philosophies of the academic departments and upon the interests and expertise of individual faculty members. Faculty members who are concerned about promotion and tenure discover that multicultural-oriented courses are often viewed as "lacking intellectual integrity" (Spitzberg and Thorndike, 1992, p. 47). For some individuals and departments at UAF the safest response to multiculturalism has been to make minimal curriculum changes, or to make none at all.

As long as most of the courses that include a multicultural or an Alaska Native focus are an *add-on* feature that remains optional for most students—and for most faculty—they do not pose a threat to those who believe, as did my graduate advisor, that the goals and purposes of research universities are not compatible with those of a university that responds to multiculturalism.

Comments

In this chapter I have examined some of the factors that have been important in shaping the academic and organizational climate of UAF. I have reviewed characteristics of the research university identity to which UAF aspires, and I have described specific program, student service and curricular changes that have been made at UAF in response to Alaska Native issues and Alaska Native students' interests and needs.

From an institutional perspective, UAF has demonstrated its willingness to assume responsibility for making structural and programmatic changes to accommodate the special circumstances of Alaska Native students. It is apparent, however, that most of these changes have been in response to external initiatives and pressures (i.e. reactive instead of proactive), and the university continues to have difficulty reconciling its dual mission as a research university and as a land-grant, public service institution responsible for meeting the needs of a large and diverse undergraduate population. The existence of the many and varied Alaska Native programs, services and courses at UAF often mask the surrounding tension and debate about their legitimacy, their place, and their centrality in a university that espouses research as its primary badge of identity.

In the following two chapters I focus on several of the same issues examined here, but from the perspective of those to whom many of the special programs and services are directed, i.e. the students. Specifically, I look at how Alaska Native students in the teacher education program on campus in Fairbanks have experienced the UAF climate and the institutional changes described in this chapter.

CHAPTER 6

FROM HIGH SCHOOL TO COLLEGE: SURVIVING THE TRANSITION

Alaska Native students at the University of Alaska Fairbanks are a highly heterogeneous mix in terms of age, family status, size and location of home communities, and linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In the group of 50 teacher education graduates whose experiences form the basis for this study there was remarkable diversity. There were 37 women and 13 men, and at the time of graduation (between 1989 and 1993) their ages ranged from 22 to 43 with more than half under the age of 30. Nineteen were single, 31 were married, and 24 had children. Their home communities were in the Far North, Interior, Southwest, Aleutian Islands and the Southeast Panhandle—and the large majority (80 percent) were from rural areas. They came from 11 distinct Alaska Native cultural and linguistic groups, and 13 spoke an Alaska Native language as their first language (mainly Yup'ik).

The majority of students in the group were members of the first generation of rural students with the opportunity to attend high school in their home communities. Their secondary educational experiences varied significantly because they attended schools in a wide variety of rural, urban and boarding home settings, where enrollments ranged from under 10 to over 2,500. Students' out-of-school work experiences, prior to their enrollment at UAF, crossed a broad spectrum including village chiefs, heavy equipment operators on Alaska's North Slope, subsistence hunters, school board members, crew bosses for fire fighting teams, and legislative assistants. Others brought with them extensive classroom experience from their work in rural schools as bilingual instructors, teacher aides and long-term substitutes. Most chose to identify themselves as Alaska Natives while attending UAF. Some, however, did not—an option available to several because of the wide range of physical characteristics in the group.

While at UAF, 13 members of the group obtained certification to teach in secondary schools, and 37 in elementary. By September, 1994, 54 percent of this group were teachers in rural schools; 4 percent were rural administrators; 15 percent were classroom teachers in urban schools; 15 percent were working in full-time education positions other than as a classroom teacher; 6 percent were in graduate school; and the other 6 percent were substituting in urban schools, not working, or employed in a field other than education.

It may seem self-evident to say that Native American college students do not all look alike, talk alike, think alike or share the same experiences. However, many of the programs and policies designed to respond to Native and other minority students' needs in colleges and universities are all too frequently developed on the assumption that minority students are a homogeneous group with a common set of academic and social interests and needs. The lack of accurate student information and the reliance upon inaccurate stereotypes contribute to an institution's propensity to filter out the diverse characteristics of Native and other minority students.

In this chapter and the next I provide information about the university experiences of a group of 50 UAF Alaska Native teacher education students. I describe the concerns that they identified as being important to them and relate these to several of the concerns that have traditionally been the focus of attention for institutions in determining success (e.g. test scores, grade point averages, graduation rates). The material I draw upon comes from three primary sources: (1) university records (i.e. transcripts and applications for admission to the teacher education program); (2) student interviews; and (3) the knowledge that I have gained as a participant and observer in the UAF setting.

I gathered information from university records for every Alaska Native student who met all of the following criteria: (1) graduated with a bachelor's degree between May of 1989 and May of 1993 with a major or minor in education; (2) qualified for an Alaska teaching certificate; and (3) completed the majority of his or her coursework on the Fairbanks campus of UAF—a total of 50 students. (In identifying my group I chose to not include the 4 Native students who completed their teacher education requirements through the university's post-baccalaureate certification program, or those who came from the off-campus teacher education program/X-CED to the Fairbanks campus to complete less than half of their university coursework.) From this information I compiled a data base which included information on 84 variables (Appendix C). I also formally interviewed 24 of the 50 students, some as opportunities became available and others purposively selected to achieve a balance in the experiences and backgrounds represented. Four of the students I interviewed were scheduled to graduate in 1993, but later made a voluntary decision to delay their graduation for personal reasons. The open-ended taped interviews provided the opportunity for students to expand on and explain information in the data base. The interview guide, which I adapted for each student, is included as Appendix D. Information from the data base is incorporated in the study in a summary format to protect the identity of the students.

Decisions about what to include from the more than 35 hours of interviews came after I had listened a second time to all of the audio tapes, typed and analyzed the transcripts, and reviewed the information in the database. Through this process I discovered that many of the themes and patterns that emerged from students' reflections on their experiences were closely associated with the *time* when events occurred relative to their university experiences. I therefore decided to organize the information in these two chapters in a fairly loose chronological framework. In this chapter I examine some of the pre-university conditions that had a direct bearing on students' UAF experiences: home communities; high schools; previous work experiences; attendance at other institutions; and reasons for selecting UAF. Then I examine some of the students' non-academic and academic concerns and experiences during their first transition year at UAF. In the next chapter I focus on students' experiences during their "middle years" and conclude with a discussion of their final (or "professional") year at UAF.

The student interviews were by far the most rewarding aspect of the entire research process. The opportunity to have uninterrupted time listening to students' reflections on their college experiences was not only informative and interesting; but, without exception, humbling. As I learned more about the day-to-day challenges and accomplishments of the members of this group I gained new insights into their educational experiences, and indeed began to understand better why descriptors like "persistent," "strong," and "determined" are so frequently used to describe Alaska Native students by people who know them well. The insights and inspirations that were generated from the interviews, however, were always tempered with the knowledge that it was now my responsibility to capture, organize and put these perspectives in a written format—in a way that would be academically acceptable and at the same time accurate, representative, and respectful of the students' experiences.

Getting Ready for College

Alaska Native teacher education graduates in the identified group came from all geographic and cultural/linguistic regions of the state. (I have not included the actual names of communities that students came from because most students are the only one from their community attending UAF.) The 12 Yup'ik Eskimo students from the Lower Kuskokwim River area in the southwest region of the state were the largest single cultural group. Nearly all students in this group were from small villages with populations of less than 500. Three other Yup'ik students were from the Lower Yukon River area, and 1 was from the Bristol Bay area. The next largest group of students were 9 Inupiat Eskimo students who came from the Bering Strait area (5 students) and the adjacent Northwest Arctic area (4 students). Ten Athabaskan students came from 7 rural Interior villages and 1 was from a small Interior "road" community. Five students grew up in Fairbanks, 4 of whom were of Athabaskan heritage. Four students were from the Southeast coastal area of the state—all of them of Tlingit or Haida background. Five Aleut students came: from Kodiak Island (2 students), and from distant communities in the Aleutians (3 students). One Yup'ik student grew up outside the state of Alaska. No students were from the North Slope area. Ninety percent of the Yup'ik students were fluent speakers of Yup'ik. Although most other students in the group learned English as their first language, nearly 60 percent of them were familiar with their Native language because they had grown up in communities where their parents and grandparents spoke English as a second language.

The 13 male students represented each of the different cultural groups and all of the major geographic regions. Fifty-three percent of the men were 25 years old or younger when they graduated from UAF (as were 51 percent of the women). The percentage of male students in this group (26 percent) approximates the percentage of Native American male graduates (27 percent) at UAF between 1975 and 1989. The smaller percentage of males is typical of gender distribution in the field of education nationally as well as at UAF. Within the field of teacher education, a significantly smaller percentage of men are in elementary education than in secondary. At UAF, an almost equal number of males and females enroll in the secondary teacher education program, whereas in the elementary program males usually represent less than 20 percent of the total group. In this group, nine of the secondary students were men and 4 were women, while 4 of the elementary students were men and 33 were women.

As described in Chapter 3, roles for Alaska Native men and women are rapidly changing in Alaska and the relationships between gender, culture and higher education are complex. Whereas students in this study seldom described situations on campus in which gender had been a critical factor, several indicated that one of their reasons for choosing to be a teacher was their concern about changing conditions for young people in rural Alaska and, in this context, several specifically referred to the high rate of suicide for young Alaskan males.

Information on students' ethnicity came from university records and from personal knowledge. Although I did not ask for specific information on degrees of ethnicity (percentage of Native blood), the information that I have suggests that well over half of the students came from families where both of the students' parents grew up in the same geographic region and shared the same cultural and linguistic background. When students did describe themselves as being of mixed heritage, this most frequently was an indication that one of their parents was a non-Native, rather than an Alaska Native from a different Alaskan cultural or linguistic background.

High School Demographics

The history of schooling in Chapter 4 provides the context for understanding the educational background that Alaska Native students bring with them to UAF. The dramatic changes that occurred in the state in the 1970s had direct consequences for this group of students in many ways, but two are particularly relevant. The first was the establishment of what are now commonly referred to as "small high schools" in rural villages throughout the state (i.e. high schools with enrollments ranging between 10 and 200). This provided most students in the group with the opportunity to be the first ones in their family to graduate from high school—and to do so at home. The second was the decentralization of education in rural Alaska with the establishment of Regional Education Attendance Areas (REAAs) for managing schools in rural communities. This structural change provided for the first time the opportunity for community input and local and regional control related to issues such as hiring of staff, curriculum design, and the development of educational standards. One consequence of both of these changes was the almost immediate increase in the number of Alaska Native high school graduates from rural areas.

Although the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) had provided rural Alaska Native people with the opportunity of attending boarding high schools in Sitka or in the Lower 48, this had simply not been a viable option for a large percentage of people. Although some of the parents of the UAF students did attend boarding schools for a short while, it was the exception rather than the rule for a Native student in this group to have parents who had graduated from high school. The parents of students who came from some of the more isolated communities did not even have the opportunity to complete elementary school. It is therefore easy to understand why the percentage of Alaska Native students who are "first generation" college students at UAF is so high—estimated at over 90 percent.

Nearly every study that examines recruitment, retention and graduation rates for university students includes information on students' high school experiences, and these experiences frequently play a central role in interpretation and analysis. In Alaska this is a particularly important issue because the majority of Alaska Native students now graduate from high schools that have very small enrollments compared to most schools elsewhere in the United States. The debate about the efficacy of the small high schools is ongoing, and the implications basically unexplored, because these schools have been in existence less than 20 years. The Alaska State Department of Education does have data showing that the graduation rate for Alaska Native students in small village high schools is considerably higher than it is for Native students in urban high schools. However, only minimal data is available that provides any information about what students do after they graduate from either small or large high schools.

To identify patterns in the high school experiences of the UAF students in this group I prepared two tables. The first, Table 5, provides information on the number of students in the study group who attended high school in each of the following five contexts and the year they graduated.

1. Urban Center (Anchorage, Fairbanks or Juneau in Alaska and urban areas outside the state)

2. Boarding Schools (BIA boarding schools both in- and out-of-Alaska, church-affiliated boarding schools in Alaska, and regional boarding home programs in Alaska)

3. Small Towns (small communities in Alaska located on the road system or marine highway)

4. Rural Center (regional communities in rural Alaska with populations over 2000)

5. Villages (villages in rural Alaska with populations under 2,000 and accessible only by air or water)

Table 5

Students' High School Contexts and Years of Graduation

Year Graduated	Urban Center	Boarding School	Small Town (Highway)	Rural Center	Village School
Pre-1970	3	1		1	
1970		1			
1971					
1972		1			
1973					
1974		2			
1975			1		
1976	1				
1977		1		1	
1978					
1979					
1980	1	1			2
1981	1				1
1982					
1983			3	1	5
1984	1	1	2	1	7
1985	1		1	1	4
1986					1
1987			1		2
Total	8 (16%)	7 (14%)	8 (16%)	5 (10%)	22 (44%)

After local high schools became available in rural villages, 96 percent of the rural students (i.e. those living in villages or rural regional centers) chose to attend school in their home community, even though there were still boarding, regional and urban high school options available to them.

Table 6 presents information on the organization (by grade structure) and size (by enrollment) of the high schools that students attended.

Table 6

Students' High School Organizations and Sizes by Enrollment

Enrollment	K-12	7-12	9-12	Total
25-49	1	4	2	7 (14%)
50-99	4	1	2	7 (14%)
100-149	7			7 (14%)
150-199	1		3	4 (8%)
200-299	1	1	9	11 (22%)
300-399		1		1 (2%)
400-499			3	3 (6%)
500-599	1			1 (2%)
600+			9	9 (18%)
Total	15 (30%)	7 (14%)	28 (56%)	50

As Table 6 figures indicate, 50 percent of all of the students in this group attended high schools where there were less than 200 students, and over half of these were K-12 schools so the graduating classes were often fewer than 10 students. Only 28 percent of the group attended a more typical American high school with a 9-12 organization. Although school size is not the only variable to be considered when examining students' high school experiences, it is not unusual to hear small schools associated with lower quality. The experiences of the students in this study indicate that school size alone is not an adequate predictor of future academic success.

Reflections on High School Experiences

All of the 7 students in this group of 50 who attended boarding schools did so because there were no high schools in their home communities at the time. Their choice of boarding school was usually made on the basis of family tradition and/or church affiliation. The boarding schools students attended included St. Mary's Catholic Mission School, Covenant School, Copper Valley Catholic School, (all church-affiliated schools which have since closed) and Mt. Edgecumbe, the former BIA boarding school now operated by the state. The Mt. Edgecumbe graduates indicated they chose that school because other family members had attended, or because they wanted to stay in Alaska and attend a non-denominational school. Only 1 student from this group attended a BIA boarding school outside of Alaska (Chemawa, in Oregon). Four other pre-1980 graduates without high schools in their home communities boarded with local families in larger regional rural communities so they could attend high school closer to home.

Although all students interviewed expressed strong support for having high schools in their home communities, 2 of them felt that their own boarding school experiences had at least provided them with some preparation for college life. One student said, "I'm glad I went to a boarding school because it prepared me for college. I learned to be away from home and how to live in a dorm when I was really young," and another reflected that "in the boarding school I learned to live with rules and regulations."

Seven of the eight students who attended large urban high schools did so because they lived in that urban area (1 student moved to the area in order to attend school there). Students in some of these urban settings reported having some of the most difficult high school experiences of any in the group of 50. Two students were so dissatisfied with their experiences in the urban high schools that they dropped out and completed their education through a "General Education Diploma" (GED) program. Others described their urban high school experiences as "terrible."

- I was trying so hard to survive; I was trying so hard just to get the basics—for my family's sake. . . .When my grades dropped it seemed like no one [at school] even noticed—it was really strange.
- I was put into lower classes just because I had brown skin.
- I was a quiet student. . . . I skipped 45 days in my senior year and no one said a thing—no one cared . . . and so I didn't learn a thing in high school. It was life afterwards that prepared me for college.

Lack of support, of recognition (by teachers and classmates) and of encouragement were common themes in the experiences of the urban high school students.

Many of the students who attended small rural high schools reported quite different experiences. Some who had always anticipated going away to boarding school, as their older brothers and sisters and sometimes their parents had done, were initially disappointed when their parents recommended that they stay home because the village now had its own school. However, all those interviewed except one said that, in retrospect, staying at home had definitely been a good decision. The student who regretted not leaving home felt that, because she had attended during the early years of the high school's operation in her community, "teachers had very low expectations for the students and no one pushed us to do anything."

Nearly every student who attended the smaller schools (i.e. those with enrollments between 10 and 200) talked about their participation in a wide variety of high school activities, whereas students from the larger schools seldom referred to this part of their high school experience. Students talked at length about their involvement in student government, school and community projects (e.g. yearbook editors, delegates to AFN, organizers of youth programs), social events (dances, potlucks, potlatches), and nearly all of them participated in sports at local, regional and state levels. They were active participants in a wide range of activities that provided them with leadership, academic and social opportunities, that they were able to draw upon when they reached college. They traveled together to places both in and out of Alaska on school-sponsored events, and several had traveled to Washington, D.C. to learn about the federal government as part of the national "Close-Up" program for high school students. They often served as teacher aides or tutors for younger children in the school, and almost all were competent computer users. Although I did not ask specifically about class standing at graduation, several students said that they were the high school class valedictorian or salutatorian. Many described their high school experiences in terms of being part of a "tightly-knit and close group," and it was clear that in the small schools a student's absence was always noted—by the teachers, by the staff or by fellow students.

Several students from the smaller high schools spoke fondly of their teachers—of their ability to teach subject matter in interesting and exciting ways while at the same time maintaining high expectations and a concern for students and their families. Specific teachers were often mentioned by students as a partial explanation for their having thought of, or actually chosen, the teaching profession as a career.

- My math teacher was really good and that was my most enjoyable class. Because of all the things she did both in and out of the class I really respected her and it made me want to be able to be a teacher like her so that I could make others feel as good about math as she made me feel.

Others talked about teachers who had high expectations and about those who developed close associations with the local community.

- I thought she was a very good teacher . . she changed my whole perspective toward education when I was in 7th grade. Before that I didn't even care what grades I got. It had been okay with me if I got a B or if I got a C. I just said [to myself] "never mind . . . I don't have the time to work hard." But then she started to make me work hard and I started enjoying it and she believed that I could do better even though she read the [negative] reports about me from other teachers.
- Some of the teachers have been there a long time now and they are committed to the community. They all have Eskimo names and they eat Native food and they go hunting with everyone else.

For many of these students, small schools offered them the opportunity to experience positive teaching and learning experiences because of low teacher-student ratios, individual attention, community-school interaction, and opportunities to develop and implement programs that were meaningful, exciting and demanding. All of this hinged, of course, on having good and caring teachers with high expectations, and on the relationship between the teachers and the community. But, just as good teachers can have a powerful and positive impact, the consequences of having a bad teacher in a small school can be devastating to an individual student, to the school climate, and to the community. As one student said, "some teachers we had made us and our parents so angry that learning was impossible." The students' responses suggest that teachers in small schools in Alaska villages play a critical role as educators and as role models, and their influence should not be overlooked or minimized.

The high school backgrounds of the students in this group indicate that many Alaska Native students who have been successful at UAF have graduated from some of the smallest high schools in the United States. These students' experiences cast a shadow of doubt over one of the most frequently heard excuses for poor student retention rates offered by the university—an excuse that shifts the blame for failure from the university to the small high schools. The contention that large urban high schools provide a superior education for Alaska Native students because of their multiple course offerings and the availability of teachers with specialized expertise is not borne out by the data or by the personal descriptions provided by the students in this study. The assumption that bigger is better is a powerful belief that still influences policy decisions at all levels of the educational system in Alaska, and yet we have very little research to support this supposition.

Why College?

Before examining students' decisions for choosing to attend UAF specifically, it is important to understand more about why they decided to go to college at all, especially since nearly all of them were first generation college students. In the interviews, students gave these primary reasons.

1. Parents and grandparents had stressed the importance and value of getting as much education as possible.

    - My grandpa and my parents were always telling us that education was the new way and that we were expected to go to college.
    - My dad always communicated to us that it was very important to get an education, especially since he and my Mom weren't able to go to high school.
    - Going to college was a foregone conclusion—my father had wanted to and couldn't.

2. Students saw college as a means of providing themselves with options for jobs and better living conditions.

    - I knew that I wanted to be able to have a better life than my parents had.
    - I wanted to have the option of staying in my village or leaving.
    - I didn't really set my mind to it until I had children of my own, and then I started encouraging them to go to college, and I knew it was going to look very strange if I never went.

3. Students needed to go to college to allow them to do what they most wanted to do—teach.

    - Even in grade school my teachers would let me help other students . . . I just realized that I had always wanted to be a teacher.

- I had pretty exceptional teachers and I wanted to follow in their footsteps.

4. Students had previously worked as teacher aides and were greatly influenced by their experiences.

- I was a teacher's aide for 4 years and thoroughly enjoyed my job—I was always mistaken for a teacher.
- After being a teacher's aide I realized that I could do the job better than they [the teachers] could.

Some students were encouraged to go to college by personnel from the UAF Rural Student Services (RSS) who had come to their area for recruitment purposes. Others remembered the influence of the out-of-state recruiters that came to the Mt. Edgecumbe boarding school and the BIA's efforts to recruit for Haskell Indian College. One student reflected on the recruiter from Sheldon Jackson who "enchanted us with the whole idea of going to Southeast Alaska." Participants in the UAF Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI) talked about the influence of that program on their decision to attend college, and some indicated that the RAHI experience gave them the courage and confidence to attend college elsewhere before they later transferred to UAF.

- I became interested in going to college and to UAF because of RAHI.
- I went to a college Outside [of Alaska] because after RAHI I wanted to go somewhere more exciting and different.

Some of the factors that allowed students to turn their college aspirations into reality included receiving a great deal of encouragement, support and advice from high school teachers and occasionally from guidance counselors.

- I had lots of help from my high school teachers. They helped with my financial aid packet and called to see if I had gotten in. I was really well taken care of.

Others used family members or local friends who had previously attended college.

- There was one other girl at home who had gone to school in Seattle and I asked her a lot of questions because she was the only one I really knew that had attempted to go to college.

Many students who attended UAF, in addition to those who attended the UAF bridging programs, received assistance with admissions and financial aid information from Rural Student Services personnel before coming to campus.

- I got a thing in the mail from RSS asking if I wanted information and advising from them. So I talked to someone from another village who had been to school at UAF and they said that was a good thing to do. . . . so I did it!

It is evident that students in this group chose to continue their education after high school for a variety of reasons, some typical of students in higher education institutions across the United States, and others more specific to the Alaska and Alaska Native context. Many in this group were the first in their families or communities to have a high school diploma and sufficient funding to make college a viable option. The majority of students were also quite certain that they wanted to become teachers before they applied to UAF. Going to college was the only means of achieving that goal.

Routes to UAF

Of the group of 50 students, 18 came directly to the Fairbanks Campus of UAF after high school and did not attended any other post secondary institutions. Five students delayed their entry for one-half to three years after graduation, but continued at UAF once they began. Six students enrolled at UAF shortly after completing high school, but because of very negative experiences did not return after their first semester, and in most instances waited several years before re-enrolling.

Twenty-one students did not begin their studies on the Fairbanks campus. Five took coursework through other UAF campuses (Kuskokwim, Northwest and Chukchi) or through the off-campus teacher education program (X-CED) before transferring to the Fairbanks campus to complete the majority of their degree requirements. Sixteen students transferred from other institutions. Three students who attended other University of Alaska campuses and 3 who had attended colleges outside of Alaska had negative experiences in those institutions that prompted them to transfer to UAF. Ten students had positive experiences at other universities (4 in Alaska and 6 Outside) and transferred to UAF for a variety of reasons.

Transferring to UAF

Like any group of students considering college, students in this group based their decision about which school to attend on several factors. Students who attended a college elsewhere prior to entering UAF went to either one of the other UA campuses (5 students), Sheldon Jackson College in Southeast Alaska (3 students), the BIA-funded Haskell Indian College in Kansas (2 students), or to schools in California, Hawaii, Montana, Oregon or Washington (10 students). One student attended a technical school prior to coming to UAF.

Students' primary reasons for choosing Sheldon Jackson College included its small size, its financial scholarships, having a relative or friend who attended, and "because the recruiter talked about the high ratio of Native students . . . I'm more comfortable within the Native environment and he [the recruiter] was right, there were a lot of Native students there and I had no trouble fitting in." Sheldon Jackson students were generally satisfied with the overall climate of the school. "It was small, people were friendly and you could walk everywhere. Some students indicated, though, that the "SJ" education program was not the best one to prepare them for teaching in the cross-cultural situation in rural Alaskan schools, and this influenced their reasons for transferring.

Some students who chose Haskell Indian College did so because they found it hard to say "no" to the opportunity to travel, meet new people, see a different part of the country—and all at little personal expense. Often, Alaska students who attended Haskell went with someone from their village or region, and for some it was clearly the right choice.

- All of the Indians down there were really amazed at all of us who had come from the villages in Alaska. They'd come and ask us lots of questions and I felt like I was really unique. The best part of it was learning about the cultures of all of the different Indian students there. . . we got to know their stories and their beliefs. . . we did have to get used to the weather and the bugs in Kansas though.

For others, Haskell was just "too far away from home, too unfamiliar," and some were bothered because there were "too many developmental [remedial] classes." Students who attended other schools outside the state had mixed experiences, but one of the primary reasons cited for returning to Alaska was the high cost involved in going to schools elsewhere.

Students who chose to go to the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) did so because of its geographical location and financial considerations. Their reasons for transferring to UAF were based on dissatisfaction with what they described as the larger and more impersonal UAA environment, the city of Anchorage itself, and because they heard that UAF had a teacher education program that would prepare them to teach in rural Alaska.

- I went to Anchorage first because it's a lot closer to home, but then I decided to switch because I learned that UAF staff were more available for help. . . I heard that the instructors and staff [at UAF] treated all students alike despite their race.
- I wanted the opportunity to learn about rural and cross-cultural education in the Fairbanks teacher education program.

UAF as a First Choice

Three groupings of students became evident when examining the records of students who made UAF their first choice: (1) those who came to the Fairbanks Campus as young students, attended briefly, left, and returned later; (2) those who began classes at one of the UAF rural sites or through the field-based teacher education program, and then later transferred to the Fairbanks campus; and (3) those who came directly to the Fairbanks campus and completed their degree requirements with relatively few interruptions.

Students in the first group came to UAF as young, energetic high school graduates who had chosen UAF primarily because it was close to home. Their first semester and first year experiences (discussed in the next section) were demoralizing for some and devastating for others. Some were certain they would never again attempt college. When they returned, however, they brought with them a reservoir of wisdom, maturity and drive that allowed them to confront some of the hurdles that had seemed overwhelming when they were younger. And although some of these students had not known for certain if they wanted to be teachers when they entered UAF, when they re-enrolled it was with that specific goal in mind.

Students who initially began to work toward their degrees on one of UAF's rural campuses or through the off-campus teacher education program, X-CED, chose to do so for several reasons: they could live in, or close to, their home community; they could take classes part time (because they were not dependent on financial aid and university housing which both require full-time enrollment); they did not have to uproot their spouse and children; they could continue subsistence activities, keep their jobs and maintain community responsibilities; and they could avoid living in an urban area. Most of them made the decision to complete their studies in Fairbanks so that they could finish in a shorter period by attending full-time without other obligations.

Out of the group of 50 students, 18 came directly to UAF after high school graduation and 5 more came within a few years. This group of students described many reasons for choosing UAF, but the two cited most frequently were: (1) familiarity with the campus and its programs because a relative or community member had attended; and (2) the availability of programs for Native students and the presence of other Native students on campus.

- I chose UAF because there's been a lot of people from our area who have gone here.
- I came because my sister was here.
- I came because my two aunts and an uncle came.

Higher education literature indicates that members of families frequently attend the same college or university. In many parts of rural Alaska, if we substitute *community* for *family*, this also holds true. It appears as though a few communities in the state have established the tradition of supporting community members who want to go to UAF. Some of these communities are in the Southwest area of the state in traditional Yup'ik villages and others are in Interior areas where there is a history of UAF involvement and/or where local UAF graduates are employed in the schools. Students made it quite clear that it was valuable to know someone personally from their area who had attended UAF or to know someone who was currently enrolled.

The importance of a sizable Native student population at UAF, and the support programs and academic coursework for and about Alaska Native people, were also at the top of the list of reasons for choosing UAF, as indicated by this sampling of statements from several students.

- UAF had an appealing Native student support system that I liked whereas UAA was very weak in this area. They didn't have any brochures with information about Native student organizations or programs or courses, whereas Fairbanks had a whole barrage of information.
- I chose UAF because there are a lot of Native students here and there are a lot of programs for Native students.
- I heard that UAF tries to implement and include rural Alaska in its curriculum. I knew I would be able to study the different cultures and languages of Alaska in my coursework.
- I came to UAF because I knew it had more classes that were relevant to our cultures here in Alaska and because my brother said they had good courses for people who wanted to teach in rural areas.

Other reasons cited included the small size of UAF, familiarity with the campus because of participation in the high school bridging programs, career ladder programs between UAF and school districts where students were employed, and the fact that UAF was located in Alaska, but *not* in Anchorage. The relative smallness of Fairbanks itself was an important consideration for many students, and my questions to them about why they bypassed Anchorage were often met with looks that implied that I was foolish even to raise the question. Their comments suggested that it was the size of the city of Anchorage itself, in addition to the lack of Native student services at UAA, that caused them to pay an additional amount of money to fly through Anchorage to come to school in Fairbanks.

- UAF looked like a real campus and it had a village feeling and a sense of community that UAA didn't have.
- It was small enough to meet people and make friends.
- I knew that I'd have a chance of getting to know somebody in classes.
- I liked the small campus with everything right here.

There was no ambiguity in students' comments about the direct influence of the Rural Alaska Honors Institute high school bridging program. One student said simply, "I came because of RAHI," whereas a transfer student who had also participated in the RAHI program said, "UAF was always my backup—I knew I would be welcome here." Others chose UAF because of support from the school districts where they were employed through career ladder development programs (particularly the Fairbanks North Star Borough and Lower Kuskokwim School Districts).

Students' reasons for selecting UAF are not typical of those described in the literature on traditional student populations where geographical location and finances play a much more critical role. The comments of many students in this group suggest they were searching for a university *community* in which they could be active, meaningful and respected participants, and they were willing to travel further and pay more in order to achieve this.

Previous Work Experiences

Before moving to descriptions of students' actual experiences in their first year on the Fairbanks campus of UAF, it is useful to inventory quickly the types of work experiences that students brought with them to the university context. It becomes obvious that in this arena also, students' previous life experiences are atypical of those of the majority of college students, but not unlike those of Alaska Native university students in general. As described in the section on high schools, nearly all of the younger students coming to UAF had served in some form of leadership role in their schools. Other students—including returning students, late-starting students, and off-campus students—also brought with them special kinds of expertise and knowledge. Many had played active roles in the development of educational, political and social policy at both a village and a regional level, and several had been employed in positions that required an understanding of state and federal guidelines and the ability to work well with people from very diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Several worked in the fishing industry either as workers for others or as owners and managers of their own commercial fishing businesses. Others served as legal secretaries, postmasters, mine workers, pulp mill managers, airline ticket agents, village store managers, computer operators, power plant operators, legislative assistants, city managers, crew bosses for fire fighting teams, and village chiefs.

Many were also directly involved with educational activities both in and out of the classroom. They served in elected positions on local and regional school boards; represented their communities for Alaska Federation of Natives conferences; and they planned, worked for, and directed summer youth camps and community youth projects. Fifteen students from the group worked in rural schools for periods of time ranging from one semester to nine years. They worked as bilingual teachers and classroom teacher aides, and they substitute taught—in some instances for as long as a year because of the acute shortage of certificated teachers in rural areas.

Many students from rural areas had work and leadership opportunities not available to people in larger urban areas, where access to positions is limited to those with "proper" paper credentials. Their positions often required that they be knowledgeable and competent in a variety of cross-cultural situations. Thus, they came to the university environment with life experiences that were often directly related to the area of study they intended, or later decided, to pursue. Their experiences in these "real life" situations (rather than, or in addition to, their experiences in high school) were an important factor in preparing them for college.

The First Year: Out-of-Classrooms Concerns

- If a student thought their college career would be like their first three weeks at UAF, they'd never make it. . . . In retrospect I realized that I had never been part of a bureaucracy before I came to UAF. My small high school was the closest I had come to one. There were a number of times during those first weeks where I had to do things over—trying to get meal tickets, library cards, choosing classes, buying books, finding classrooms, etc.—it was really awful. It definitely was not a pleasurable experience. . . . I had to rely completely on my friend. The bureaucracy at UAF leaves a lot to be desired.

Comments like this were frequently made by students who came to UAF before the beginning of the Early Orientation Program for Students (EONS) in 1984, or by students who were not aware of, or who chose not to participate in, the special services for new students that Rural Student Services (RSS) has provided in recent years. In addition, major changes in the past few years in the UAF class registration process have contributed to decreasing some of the bureaucratic stress.

The students' strongest memories of UAF often came from events that occurred during their first few weeks when they remembered feeling confused, overwhelmed and sometimes isolated.

- When I got to UAF, it was really hard having to talk to so many people that I didn't know personally.
- I was so confused the day I arrived that I finally just left my dorm room, went walking and found the Wood Center where I asked for a pay phone. I called my mom [who lived in a very small village very far away from Fairbanks] and asked her what I should do next.

One student summed up the feeling that several students expressed with her recollection that "I did not feel connected to anyone . . . I really needed someone to know I was there—or not there."

For some students, especially those who came to UAF directly from high school with a sense of adventure and a confidence in their ability to tackle college, the events of the first few weeks were enough to make them seriously question their decision to go to college.

- I was an honors student in my high school [a larger boarding high school] and my first academic experiences at UAF just shattered my ego—I began to not like who I was—the whole experience was totally threatening, and humbling too.

For many students however, problems of this nature were overshadowed by the more immediate logistical problems of housing and transportation. The concerns of students who had families of their own were quite different from single students who were living in residence halls. Frequently these non-academic concerns took precedence over academics.

Housing for Students Who Were Parents

There were 18 students—14 females and 4 males—who had children of their own before they began their studies at UAF. In addition, 12 students in the group of 50 became parents of one or two children during their time at UAF. A total of 26 students were parents by the time they graduated.

Students who had lived in Fairbanks prior to beginning their studies at UAF (6 students) usually had off-campus housing and a car, and they were familiar with local options for child care. Students coming in from out of town, however, faced major hurdles in their efforts to settle themselves and their families. Families who applied far enough ahead of time (a year or more) were usually fortunate enough to be able to live in the married student housing units on campus (HESS Complex). Other students were usually able to get into another married student housing unit (Yak Estates) located four miles from campus (which has since been sold by the university). Students with cars were generally quite happy with this off-campus student housing unit that was located in a quiet, wooded area in the hills. However, for the majority who had no cars, transportation to and from town was a serious problem. Since public buses ran for only limited hours it was very difficult for students to get to evening classes, take their pre-school children to child care locations, attend functions at their older children's schools, do the grocery shopping, or get to medical appointments.

Finding cheap and reliable transportation in Fairbanks is one of the biggest challenges for students from rural areas. Approximately 90 percent of rural students come to Fairbanks without cars, without money to purchase one, without money to pay the high Alaska insurance premiums, and without a driver's license because of the very limited number of cars and roads in rural areas, where the preferred modes of transportation (i.e. boats, snowmachines, four-wheelers and planes) do not require automobile driver's licenses. Students found themselves in a real double-bind because they did not even have access to vehicles so that they could learn to drive. One student described having an opportunity to practice driving when she was an Upward Bound student many years ago—an option no longer available. Most students walked a lot, used buses whenever possible, spent a great deal of money on taxi cabs, and tried to make friends with people who had cars.

Other problems encountered by students as parents included finding reliable and reasonably-priced child care (a concern voiced by virtually every parent who was interviewed); the unanticipated difficulties encountered when single parents or couples discovered that the niece, nephew, cousin, or younger sister or brother they brought to Fairbanks with them to take care of their young children was prohibited from living with them in married student housing because of university regulations; and students' concerns with helping their children and "trailing spouses" find meaningful and comfortable niches in the larger Fairbanks community. Some students had no choice but to leave their spouse and children in their home communities because of housing, child care, and transportation complications, and many students indicated that their school schedules were organized around their children's needs.

- I chose whatever classes I could fit in between the hours my kids were in school.
- I used to call my husband two or three times each week. . . . to talk about how the kids [some were with him] were doing, to let him know how we were doing and just to take care of the mechanics of running a household and family.
- I chose classes based on my kids.....based on the least amount of time I would have to spend apart from my children.
- Four days after my son was born I was up here on campus again. He was such a good baby that I could take him to class with me—fortunately I didn't have a PE class that semester. . . . I wore my parka and kept him inside and people couldn't see him, but they'd see these two little baby mukluks sticking out. . . . I could take notes with my right hand, hold him in a snugglie with my left hand, and he never cried out—he never did. I was able to bring him to school that entire semester.
- My first child was born during my second year of college . . . and my husband and I just arranged our classes so he'd go to class, run home and then I'd go to class. It became a regular thing . . . we just gradually grew into the routine of learning how to have kids and go to college at the same time. . . . We both always had to keep a full load of credits though so we could get our financial aid.

There was a strong consensus among students about the academic and social benefits of living in a campus community where they and their families were surrounded by other students who were all going through the same experiences.

- When I moved into family student housing I could put my whole mind on the fact that I was a full time student and part of a university group. . . . We were all there to help each other and I got a lot of support from other families. I felt part of a community and my children could relate to all of the other kids because we were all struggling together and none of us had any money. In fact, my campus housing even kept me in school one semester when I was so down I wanted to drop out. I stayed in school only because I didn't want to move out of student housing. It was a wonderful place for me and my kids.
- Child care would have been terrible if not for neighbors at HESS [the married student housing complex].
- Living on campus was so good because it is close [to the library, classroom buildings, etc.], the rates are reasonable and it's secure. There was a lot of support from other students who had families too . . . but the water tastes terrible!

- The cost [of Yak Housing] was good and the neighborhood was safe for the kids. I felt lucky to get in . . . but the problem was that it was so far away. It's best to live right on campus because it's cheaper and everything is right there.

- Yak Housing was a place that was almost like a small village, but living that far off campus and having so many required education classes at night made child care very difficult.

Housing for Single Students

For single students living on campus the challenges associated with housing arrangements were of a different nature, and for many their first memories were those associated with roommates and with issues of safety and security. About half of the students living in a residence hall chose to let the university housing office match them with a roommate during their first semester.

- I never chose a roommate. I was always assigned one and surprisingly I got along well with all of them except one. He, like the others, was non-Native and he was the only one of them who didn't like Native people, and he was even from Alaska. It was weird. . . . My other roommates were from other places and they liked me and liked hearing about Native culture and liked trying the foods my Mom sent.

- My first roommate, who I didn't chose, was the first non-Native person that I got along with so quickly.

After the first semester or year, however, most were actively involved in selecting their own roommate, and several chose to live with someone from their home region. Quite a few students lived in single rooms by their third or fourth year.

- My first roommate was a non-Native and I learned a few things about other people from him. Before [living with him] I had thought that all white students were smart and studious and hard-working and so forth, but he shattered those preconceptions. He was really lackadaisical, and he was surprised that I was so gung ho [about studying] . . . I got a single room after that.

In addition to roommates, an issue frequently brought up by students was safety. One younger student described a university mistake that "turned out to be the best thing that ever happened" to her at UAF. In her application to UAF, she requested housing in one of the smaller halls that was, unknown to her, designated as an above-age hall where the average age was 26. Although the university tried to convince her to move after she arrived, she quickly learned of the benefits of being in a smaller hall with a group of mature and concerned older students, and she was able to convince UAF officials to let her stay there.

- At that time [as a new freshman] I had no real concept of danger. . . and because I was put in that dorm with people of that age I ended up with a lot of father and mother type figures. I had never before lived in a place where I had problems getting around and because of this I was often feeling claustrophobic, and I would go walking late at night. When I returned to the dorm there would always be at least one person waiting in the stairwell to see if I was okay. They knew about things that I didn't even consider as real problems or dangers. The people in that dorm helped me a lot . . . my support network was the entire dorm because we all knew each other, and the next year lots of my friends were still there.

Safety in general seemed to be more of a concern to both male and female students who lived in the larger residence halls in the "upper campus complex" (three connected dormitories with a capacity for 710 students—the largest holding 315 students) than for students who lived in the smaller, separate residence halls closer to the dining commons and campus center (five separate dormitories that have a total capacity of 542 students with the largest holding 140 students).

- It just wasn't a safe environment—there was a whole brand new kind of fear that came with living in the dorm . . . and then we even had all the party animals in our dorm one year [during a period of time when the all-male dorm was closed]. We just had to group all the time.
- Well, what's unfortunate is that before academics even come into play, safety had to be our first concern. My priority sometimes was not "how am I going to make it through class" but how am I going to make sure I don't wake up in the middle of the night to find that he [my roommate] left my door wide open again. When we'd go out we'd usually go together in groups . . . it was safer that way.

Several female students chose to live in the only all-female dorm on campus because "I come from a family with almost all girls" or "my brother said it would be a good place for me" or "because it's one of the smaller dorms where the atmosphere is good and where you know people and they know you." Until the fall of 1993 there were no telephones in any of the students' residence hall rooms. (In the spring of 1993—after I had completed all of the interviews—a young Native woman was brutally raped and murdered in the bathroom of one of the upper complex residence halls. In August of 1994, the murder had not yet been solved.)

Special housing arrangements, such as NANA House (the housing facility and student support arrangement provided for students from the NANA region), that provide a small home-like atmosphere for first and second year students is a concept endorsed by students from the NANA area and from those in other areas of the state. Two students from the study group lived in the NANA house as students, 4 worked and lived there in the role of resident advisors, and several students talked about visiting friends there. In addition to remembering the family type atmosphere, students often commented on the availability of Native foods at the NANA house—made possible because of a large freezer in which students could store food sent from their families back home. Fund raising activities to build a similar housing facility for students from the Interior Region (Doyon House) are currently underway.

- I think a Doyon House [like the NANA House] is an excellent idea. Students in NANA had so much support. I used to visit my friends there and they [the students in NANA] didn't seem as "mischief" as we were in the dorms.

Students who were single parents were especially interested in the idea of having a similar type of housing support system available for them and their children—an option yet to be explored by the university.

University Significant Others

In addition to the first year factors already described, an additional common theme was present in the interview of nearly every student. This was the importance of what one student humorously referred to as her "significant other," and what I have thought of since as a "USO"—a "university significant other." Almost without exception students told of one person who served as their mentor, guide, and friend during the first days, weeks or months of the first year. For many it was an older brother or sister or cousin, or a friend from home who was already at UAF or who had previously been to UAF and "knew the ropes." For others it was a person they had met previously through their high school RAHI experience—most often an advisor in Rural Student Services. For others the USO was a teacher who had previously taught in their village and who had since moved to Fairbanks. In one instance, a student met her mentor in her dorm—an older student who had been on campus for two years. The following comments are typical of student references to a USO.

- I had a cousin who was here and she was instrumental in helping me to stay at UAF. I didn't know anything about majors and minors and she explained it all to me. She walked with me to all the different buildings. Since she was a junior she understood a lot about how university systems work. She also introduced me to all of her friends right away so I had an extended family.

- My sister had been at UAF before and she was just returning to school again—she knew the ropes. She told me all about RSS. It was even scary going to the cafeteria alone. I'm really glad my sister was here at first.

- My brother helped me figure out which dorm I should be in, and he told me to go to RSS. He also helped me with my classes and told me I should always go to see my instructors. He also said that I shouldn't miss any study sessions because they would help in my classes and I would meet other students that way. He always told me to study, study, study! [His advice] was part of the reason that I was the only one from my area that came back to UAF the next semester.

- I knew that I needed some kind of support [if I was going to try college a second time]. I needed to have someone I knew and could feel comfortable with—that person was my aunt. She was going to school here at the time, and so she got me connected with a lot of people and told me about RAHI. She introduced me to RSS people and services . . . and you know, it was that that helped me to make the transition.

  I found that I had support, there was somebody to talk to, there was somebody that knew the courses, somebody that knew the professors, there was somebody that looked—actually looked carefully—at my transcripts and said that I needed to get some developmental work in some areas. I didn't have any of that kind of support before, and I knew that I needed it.

- I vividly remember my first day because I got lost. I was so glad there were people from my area at UAF that I knew. My first registration took six hours and I was ready to go home. I discovered that the only place I could turn to was RSS where there were other people from my area. . . and my advisor was very supportive and told me where to go and told me about some good shortcuts.

- One of my former teachers was here at UAF and he helped me a lot because he knew where I was coming from . . . and because of my cousin I was able to meet other students. This was the first time I had ever left my home community on my own.

For a few students, the USO was a person on the other end of a phone—but again it was someone who was familiar enough with the overall system to serve as an effective liaison between the student and the larger university system—sometimes buffering the student, but more frequently providing him or her with accurate information, sensitive feedback and a sense of humor that helped students see themselves in a bigger context and dispel some of their doubts, fears and insecurity. In addition, the USOs were people who had a genuine belief in the freshman or transfer student's ability to succeed in a university environment. They knew the students well, accepted them for who they were, listened to them patiently and truly believed in their ability to succeed.

Providing every new student at UAF with a USO is not a realistic option because, even if the university decided to adopt a buddy program (such as those used by some universities where new freshman are paired up with older returning students), the bond that existed between many students and their USO could not be easily replicated by a stranger. Most *non-Native* students come to a university setting with one, and often several, USOs because they frequently have at least one parent who has attended college and/or there are almost always fellow high school students who also attend college. However, for many students in this study, there was often not a single person in their immediate or extended family who had ever attended college, and in some instances the only other person in their community who could provide "insider" kind of information was a teacher.

There is of course no way to judge objectively how critical the role of a USO was in each student's survival the first year, but it was clear to me in the interviews that the role this person played was pivotal. It was permanently etched into the memories of the students as they recalled and described what this person had done. These were all unsolicited comments, because I did not have a specific question that asked students whether or not there had been a person who served in this kind of role. While it may be the case that universities cannot provide every student with an individual USO, they can recognize that many first generation college students—especially those who come from cultural and linguistic minority or rural backgrounds—need a culturally sensitive social and emotional support system along with academic support, if they are to succeed in a university setting.

Other Non-Academic Considerations

Finding friends is a big concern for freshmen, and so is the challenge of managing the new freedom they are experiencing through opportunities to party, socialize, and otherwise be distracted from academic pursuits. When I asked students what they did "for fun" in their freshman year, the responses were fairly consistent. Students with children sometimes went to campus basketball games, but without cars their other most frequent "fun" activity was finding time to watch some TV and catch up on much-needed sleep. Some students who lived in the residence halls participated in scheduled social activities, but with the exception of dances, the residence halls were generally not the locus of social life for most students. One described the important role that a resident advisor (RA) can play in getting students involved.

- I had a really good RA who got Native and non-Native students involved in activities, and we did a lot of floor activities together. The RA can be a really important person—especially for freshmen.

Others recalled going to dorm dances, and as one student observed "they were fun and there were a lot of Native students there." Some also recalled friends of theirs who were no longer at UAF because their grades had suffered when they had not been able to resist the temptation to join in with others on their floor for too many informal, late week-night dorm gatherings, or because they partied too much in the dorm on weekends. Some students also talked about the double standards that were often used to judge the "party" behavior of Native students. They described instances where non-Native students who partied too much were viewed by dorm personnel as individuals who had simply used bad judgment. By comparison, Native students who did the same thing were frequently viewed as behaving that way because they were Native students and therefore prone to such behavior. One student recalled the sad feelings she had whenever she saw a Native student on campus who had too much to drink because of the tendency to generalize such an individual's behavior to all Native students. Some students felt that the behavior of a small number of Native students was too often used by non-Native students (and sometimes university personnel) to confirm inaccurate stereotypes.

Many of the students in the study had grown up in rural Alaskan communities where alcohol had been (and still continues to be) a major contributor to many accidental deaths and suicides, and alcohol abuse had caused a great deal of sadness, grief, and anger for them and for their families. Their comments provided clear evidence that most of them came to UAF having already thought very seriously about the consequences of excessive drinking. Some from this group chose not to drink at all, others chose to do so but only in private settings with close and trusted personal friends; and a few made mistakes that they later regretted.

Single students who were looking for alternate sources of entertainment and social life often went off campus. Several students indicated that off-campus activities were an important source of entertainment during their first year—especially going to movies on weekends. They also went off campus to shop, go to restaurants, and some went to "The Center" to learn to roller skate. They usually would take the city bus into town and return via taxicabs because the buses didn't run after 7:00 o'clock in the evening. The lure of the city was hard to resist in the first year.

> - Most of us come from villages where there's not a lot of things to do. . . . We don't have movie theaters and big stores . . . but you come in here and everything's open all the time, and you see so many things you want to do. At first it's easy to over socialize. It's also easy to use your money up too quickly.

Some on-campus students participated in church-related activities, but this usually required finding transportation off campus, except for Catholic students who could attend Sunday Mass at UAF. Students who came from communities with strong religious traditions, especially those from some of the Yup'ik areas where there are strong Catholic, Moravian or Russian Orthodox influences, indicated that the absence of the familiar church presence seemed strange.

Other non-academic activities reported by students included exercising and participating in informal sport activities. Several students enrolled in one or more of the one-credit "fun" PE classes like aerobics and weight training in order to keep in shape, or they enrolled in other classes in order to learn new sports such as swimming or ice skating. Several of the male students had been avid basketball players in high school, and they said they went to the gym frequently to play informally with friends. Many of the Native students went to UAF basketball games—and most sat together in the same place at each game.

Finances, of course, set boundaries on what students could or could not do, especially for off-campus activities. For the younger students the biggest challenge was to learn how to allocate the lump sum of money they received at the beginning of each semester (from their financial aid package and summer earnings) so that it would last through the semester or year. It was also critical that they maintained a good GPA because otherwise they would lose all, or part, of their financial aid. Most students financed their education with money from the following sources: Federal Pell Grants, which are awarded to all eligible students on the basis of financial need; BIA grants issued through tribal entities and regional non-profit corporations and based primarily on financial need; summer job earnings; scholarships from regional profit corporations; Alaska Teacher Scholarship Loans (up to $7500 per year based on the recommendation of rural school districts—all of it remitted if the student teaches in a rural school for five years); Alaska Student Loans (up to $5,500 per year at 8% interest); and jobs on campus. A few received some money from their families—oftentimes from an older brother or sister or an aunt or uncle. With proper planning, most single students reported that they usually had no really serious money problems, but students who had children said that they were always struggling to try and make ends meet. Even going home in the summer to earn more money was expensive because they had to pay to store their household items in Fairbanks over the summer, and the average airfare to any village other than those in the Interior region was about $800—so for a family with two or three children, even the up-front costs were quite daunting.

Nearly all of the students interviewed recalled that they were able to meet both the non-academic and the academic challenges of the first year only by relying heavily on the support services offered through Rural Student Services. There were multiple stories of students being "saved" through the expertise, assistance and energy of RSS personnel. Since the RSS approach to assisting rural and Native students is based on providing an integrated, comprehensive service, any student at any time (i.e. new, returning, transfer, single, married) was able to turn to them for help with a myriad of questions and concerns related to everything from academic advising to financial aid to getting assistance with filling out health insurance release forms for Native Americans to suggestions related to child care. Several students indicated that RSS was also a good place to "just hang out."

- The RSS lounge was the only place I found when I got to UAF where I knew that I could have good coffee, talk Yup'ik, and be with other black haired people.

Academics was, of course, students' primary reason for attending UAF—and it is, presumably, the university's primary reason for being there. However, as every student and faculty member knows, teaching and learning does not occur only within the confines of a classroom environment. The wider context of the university community impacts and influences what can and does happen in the academic sphere, and it is artificial to attempt to separate academics and coursework from the larger context in which they occur. In fact, it was the non-academic aspects of their experiences that students recalled most vividly when I asked them to reflect on their first year.

Since there is such a high proportion of Alaska Native students for whom the UAF campus is literally a "home-away-from-home," it should be no surprise that their campus/community concerns, such as finding safe housing, good roommates and neighbors, transportation, or dependable and affordable child care, ranked as high on their list of priorities as finding the right courses to take. In their view, these concerns had to be taken care of first, so that they would have a conducive environment in which to study.

The First Year: Academic Concerns

Alaska Native students, like all university students, deal with a wide range of academic concerns from the time they apply for admission until they graduate. The options available to, and the decisions that are made by, Alaska Native students themselves, as well as by the university, are, sometimes, influenced by unique factors. Not the least of them is that Alaska Native students' scores, like those of several other cultural and linguistic minority groups, on standardized tests such as the American College Test (ACT) or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), have consistently been lower than the UAF or national average. Since these scores play a pivotal gatekeeping role early on in decisions regarding student placement, it does not take long for Native students to find themselves under the cloud of self doubt and low expectations that hovers over any students who do not perform well on tests—regardless of whether it is because they lack the preparation or just have not mastered the art of test-taking. The academic consequences of poor test scores are felt throughout the first year and beyond.

UAF, for all practical purposes, has an open admission policy. Even though formal admission policies were tightened in 1991, students who do not meet the minimum standards for admission to a four-year degree program can still be accepted as associate-of-arts (AA degree) students while they establish an academic track record. There are no penalties for entering as an associate degree student. Although UAF requires that all new students (and transfer students with less than 30 credits) take the ACT, the test scores do not play any role in the admission process itself, but are used instead to determine appropriate placement in English and math courses. Students who do not meet the minimum English or math scores for entry-level college courses are placed in one of three levels of "developmental" (i.e. pre-college level) courses in those subjects.

In addition to all of the usual pre-college developmental English and math courses offered in most colleges and universities, other communication and math skills classes are offered at UAF through the Cross-Cultural Communications (CCC) Program and the Student Support Services Program (see Appendix A). These are courses designed for students who meet federal requirements that they be a first generation college student, a student whose personal income falls below a predetermined level, and/or a student who is academically under-prepared. None of the 100 level developmental math or communication skills courses can be used to meet specific degree requirements, though in some degree programs they can be used as free electives. Nearly all of the 50 students in the group associated with this study were eligible for one or more of these specially designed communication and math classes

The CCC Program also offers a class for Native students that is referred to as a "link" course. This type of course is designed to provide new students with the opportunity to take two classes that have been formally linked with one another, e.g. a three-credit required academic class such as history, biology or political science, linked with a three-credit 100 level CCC class. In the CCC class the instructor uses the material and the organization of the required class as the basis for providing students with information and advice on how to study most efficiently and effectively, take notes, write papers and take exams in a university environment. Students receive three academic credits for the CCC link class, but these credits are not counted toward meeting degree requirements.

As part of my research I gathered the following information for each of the 50 students in the study: ACT scores of all students who came to the Fairbanks Campus as new students or as transfer students with less than 30 credits; titles of CCC or other developmental math or communication skills courses in which students enrolled; grades for all required UAF English, math, speech and science courses; and grade point averages (GPAs) for selected semesters. These data provide salient information on students' academic experiences, and they also provide a basis for examining relationships between ACT scores, the number of developmental courses taken, grades in different disciplines and students' GPAs.

It is important to remember that the information in the following tables is based only on the 33 students (out of the 50 in the study group) for whom the university has ACT scores. There are no scores available for the other 17 students because they transferred to the Fairbanks campus after completing at least 30 credit hours elsewhere. In most cases the transfer students came to UAF with their basic math, English and speech requirements already satisfied.

An analysis of the ACT results indicates that the average score of the students in the study group (14.2 composite) was about five points lower than the average score of all UAF freshmen (19.6). What is most interesting and informative, however, is not that the scores were lower, but that the students in this group were able to develop strategies to either compensate in areas where they were academically unprepared, and/or they were able to demonstrate through their coursework that the scores they received were not an accurate predictor of their ability to do college level work. Either way, the data warrants a closer look.

Math Classes and Test Scores

All students in the elementary education program at UAF were required to take nine credits of college level math. Any student who did not receive a grade of C or above had to retake the class. Students desiring secondary certification were required to take only three credits of university level math unless their specific area of study demanded more (e.g. math or science). Nearly all students in the study chose to take Math 131, a basic and general math class with an emphasis on real world application, or Math 107, a college algebra class. A small number of students chose business math or calculus. Most students acquired additional math credits by taking Math 205 and Math 206, "Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers."

Table 7 includes the following information: the range and distribution of ACT math scores for the 33 students, and grades received in college level math courses by students and organized on the basis of ACT scores.

Table 7

Students' ACT Math Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Math Courses

ACT Math Scores	Number of Students	Number of A's in Math Courses	Number of B's in Math Courses	Number of C's in Math Courses	Number of D's in Math Courses	Number of F's in Math Courses
20 - 25	6	2	5	3	0	1
15 - 19	7	2	5	4	0	1
10 - 14	8	1	6	9	2	5
1 - 9	12	2	1	9	9	2

In addition to taking these college level math courses, several students also took developmental math courses. (Since most of the students in this study were enrolled in the special CCC courses and not in the general UAF developmental courses for math and English, I have used the term "CCC" to describe all developmental math and English courses.) An analysis of the CCC math classes taken by students indicates that students who received ACT scores in the upper quartile did not take any CCC math courses, whereas those with scores in the bottom quartile took at least one and often two courses. All but 2 students with scores in the middle quartiles took at least one CCC class. Out of the total group of 33 students, 11 took no CCC math courses. Sixteen students took one course and 6 took two courses to help them prepare for the math courses that were required.

Students who had ACT scores in the highest quartile did not necessarily receive better grades in their math classes than those whose scores placed them in the next group. In fact, the math class grades for students who had ACT scores in the upper two quartiles (the 15 to 25 range) were distributed in a very similar pattern. Students, however, who had the lowest ACT scores, did receive the lowest grades in their math classes. During the interviews, when I asked students with the higher ACT scores to reflect on why they did not get better math grades, they said they thought it was because they were "a little too confident and cocky," or because they had not yet understood how to "pace themselves" (in terms of keeping up with the work and assignments) in order to succeed in a college level math class. The students, however, who had ACT scores in the two middle ranges were frequently those who were the most concerned and anxious about doing well in math, and so they took advantage of a variety of support services including CCC classes, study groups set up through RSS, study partners that they met with informally at RSS, and individual or group tutoring provided through the Student Support Services Program. In addition, they were extremely conscientious about attending class and completing all assignments on time. Their grades are evidence that their initiative and effort paid off. Some of the lower math ACT scores were those of students who pursued the secondary certification route because their specific academic major required them to complete only one three-credit math class.

It is evident that nearly all of the students who did not score in the top quartile on the ACT did take at least one developmental math course, and most of the students who were interviewed felt that this class provided them with a firm foundation for their required math classes. Most also commented upon the importance of having small classes and of having demanding, but non-demeaning, instructors who were willing to work with them in both in- and out-of-class settings.

The information in Table 7 shows that although the ACT scores of this group of students were lower than the university average, this did not prohibit them from successfully completing their math requirements. Completion of a single developmental course and/or maximum use of personal and university resources allowed the majority of students to compensate for either their inability to demonstrate their math skills on a standardized test or for their inadequate math preparation in high school.

Much of the research on the relationship between ACT or SAT scores and college success has been inconclusive and ambiguous, but there is mounting evidence that these tests discriminate against students on the basis of cultural, linguistic, ethnic, religious, and even geographic background (Nettles, 1991). If test scores had been used as a gatekeeping device for admission at UAF, as they are in many schools, the majority of these 33 students would never have been given the opportunity to demonstrate that they were capable of doing college level math work.

English and Speech Classes and Test Scores

All students at UAF were required to take three communication courses: English 111, a basic freshman English class; English 211 or 213, intermediate sophomore level English classes; and a 100 level introductory speech class—all limited to an enrollment of 25 students. Just as in math, nearly all Native students whose scores made them ineligible for English 111 (and in some instances, others whose scores did qualify them for English 111) took one or more of the CCC courses that were designed specifically for Native or rural students in their first year. Some of these courses were developmental (i.e. below a 100 level), and some were at the 100 (i.e. freshman) level. Table 8 provides information on ACT English scores and English classes in the same manner that the information was presented in Table 7 for math. I have also included information on students' course grades for the required freshman speech class because it was the only other UAF communication course that all UAF students were required to complete, and some of the skills necessary for successful completion of speech are similar to those required in the English courses.

Table 8

Students' ACT English Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Communication Skills Classes

ACT English Scores	Number of Students	Number of A's in English/ Speech Courses	Number of B's in English/ Speech Courses	Number of C's in English/ Speech Courses	Number of D's in English/ Speech Courses	Number of F's in English/ Speech Courses
20 - 25	15	2/1	6/4	2/0	0	0
15 - 19	10	2/0	13/7	2/2	0	0
10 - 14	13	2/0	14/7	9/5	0	4
1 - 9	3	2/1	4/2	2/0	1/0	1/0

Based on the information in Table 8, it is evident that for English (and speech), just as for math, it is difficult to make predictions about students' grades on the basis of ACT scores alone. Although students' scores are below the average at UAF, the patterns that emerge here indicate that students with ACT scores in all quartiles did well in their English and speech courses—that is, the majority of them received a grade of B or above. What is less certain is the relationship between the preparatory CCC courses and the grades that students received in their English and speech courses.

In English, as in math, CCC preparatory classes were available for eligible students. These included courses in reading and writing and in the CCC courses that "linked" with a required course. Only 1 of the 15 students who had ACT English scores in the upper quartile took a CCC class, whereas 15 of the 23 students who scored in the middle quartiles took two or three CCC classes. All 3 students in the lowest quartile took at least one CCC class to prepare them for their required university communication courses.

In the interviews, students' comments about their CCC communication skills courses were somewhat more ambiguous than their comments about the CCC math classes. Some felt that the courses had played a pivotal role in helping them to prepare for successful experiences in other university classes.

- The CCC classes were really good for me . . . especially because the instructor took an interest in me and even called and asked me why I wasn't doing as well as she knew I could.

Others expressed concern with what they felt was an inappropriate placement in a class based solely on the high school they graduated from, or on the basis of a single test score. Some students were especially upset when they later discovered that these courses could not be used to satisfy any degree requirement.

- My first advisor was in another department [not an RSS advisor] and he put me in every CCC class there was because I was a Native student and he didn't even tell me that they wouldn't count. I did not belong in the English CCC courses!

Some students also commented that they were bothered by the fact that all of these courses were labeled "cross-cultural" when they were actually developmental or preparatory courses designed for Native students and most could not be used to satisfy degree requirements. One student said that she felt her CCC communication courses were "baby-sitting classes for Natives."

It is possible that the responses from some of the more disgruntled students were colored by the type of experience they later had in their English or speech courses. Some attributed their success in English and speech directly to their CCC class, whereas others attributed it to the fact that they had excellent instructors in the English and speech classes and they felt they could have succeeded in them without taking any CCC courses (i.e. they felt that they had a successful experience because the course was taught well—not because of the CCC preparation). If all freshman students could be guaranteed demanding, but individually-oriented English and speech classes like those that some students described, perhaps a higher percentage of students might succeed in these courses without having to complete one or more CCC classes first.

- I had a really neat English 111 instructor who made it easy for me to talk to him, and I was very comfortable with that class because there were very few students in there and the instructor held conferences with all of us. I didn't have a choice but to go and talk

> to him and that way I was able to get to know him and he got to know me. That really helped me to get comfortable with talking in class too.

Like most of the standard university developmental classes, the majority of the CCC communication classes are taught by non-tenure track instructors. However, at least once a year one of the CCC classes is taught by a tenure-track faculty member who has a joint appointment in the CCC Program and the Department of Anthropology. This arrangement provides freshman students with the opportunity to meet, work with, and have access to faculty members who are not only knowledgeable in their academic discipline, but who are also well versed in the area of cross-cultural communication.

Science Classes and Test Scores

All students in the teacher education program are required to take two science classes, and they often wait until their second year to begin this requirement. During the period covered by this study, no preparatory or developmental courses were offered in science; ACT scores were not used for course placement; and unlike the English and speech courses, science courses with small enrollments were seldom available . (There were some semesters though when a CCC course was linked with a science course.) Nearly all science courses were offered as very large lecture classes accompanied with smaller labs. Students had the option of taking courses in any of the major science areas (e.g. biology, chemistry, geoscience, physics), but nearly all students in this group (and almost all others in the teacher education program) enrolled in at least one biology class, and often two, to satisfy the science requirement. Students indicated that they chose biology because they saw more relevance between the biology course content and what they would be expected to teach in elementary schools, and/or because there were evident connections between biology and their everyday lives—particularly for those from a rural environment. The "Natural History of Alaska" course was especially popular with students in this group.

The figures in Table 9 indicate that the grades students received in their science courses were much lower than those in their required English, math and speech courses, and several students were required to retake one of their science courses because they received a grade of "D" or "F." Students' grades for all the different science courses are combined in Table 9 because the science class options available for students were greater than in math, English or speech. However, based on an analysis of the courses selected, the most frequently chosen courses after biology were from the fields of chemistry, geoscience and space science, and the choices made and grades received by students were fairly evenly distributed among these options. While students' ACT scores in natural science were generally higher than in math or English, this is not significant because the scores of all students are higher for natural science. As was true in the areas of math and English, higher ACT scores were no guarantee of higher grades in any of the science courses.

Table 9

Students' ACT Natural Science Scores and Grades Received in Required UAF Science Courses

ACT Natural Science Scores	Number of Students	Number of A's in Science Courses	Number of B's in Science Courses	Number of C's in Science Courses	Number of D's in Science Courses	Number of F's in Science Courses
20 - 31	11	0	6	10	4	2
15 - 19	11	3	5	9	3	1
10 - 14	8	0	5	3	3	2
6 - 9	2	0	1	1	1	1

Over the past 20 years a small number of specially funded, small experimental science classes, designed specifically to respond to the interests and concerns of Native and rural students, have been offered. One student fondly recalled the chemistry class she took in this experimental setting.

- It was a small chemistry class and it was wonderful. It was hard but we all worked closely together and really supported each other. Even though it was a special class the teacher didn't make us feel stupid or like we were in a dummy class. He made us feel really comfortable with science.

In the interviews, most students talked about science classes as being particularly difficult because of the large enrollments, little or no opportunity for meaningful interaction with their professors, and few or no provisions for small preparatory classes like those available in English and math. At a time when there is such a great deal of concern by both educators and the general public alike about the inadequate science preparation that United States students receive (at all levels of their education), it is curious that UAF has made little or no response to this need.

Grade Point Averages

In addition to the scores on standardized tests, the other measure that is used most frequently to interpret, explain, predict and evaluate student success in university settings is grade point average—the GPA. Table 10 presents the GPAs for all 50 students for their first, second, third and fourth semesters at UAF. It also includes cumulative GPAs of the students in this group after completing 100 credit hours and after completing all of their degree requirements (i.e. their final GPA with a minimum of 130 credit hours).

Table 10

Students' Grade Point Averages at UAF

Grade Point Average	First Semester at UAF	Second Semester at UAF	Third Semester at UAF	Fourth Semester at UAF	After 100 Credit Hours	Final GPA
3.50 - 4.00	8	7	4	6	5	5
3.00 - 3.49	16	17	14	15	13	16
2.50 - 2.99	15	17	14	14	21	26
2.00 - 2.49	8	7	14	8	8	3
Below 2.00	2	1	2	5	0	0

The information in Table 10 includes first semester GPAs at UAF for both freshman students and for transfer students so it does not represent how all students did during their first semester of college, but rather how they did during their first semester on the Fairbanks campus of UAF.

Most students received higher overall GPAs for their first semester than their second. Based on a review of the individual transcripts, one explanation for this is that many students took a cautious approach their first semester taking only four classes (12 credits), and of these, one and frequently two were CCC developmental classes and these were included in their GPA. After they had successfully completed their courses the first semester (and had begun to understand some of the unwritten rules that are crucial to academic success), they felt confident enough to tackle five courses the following semester (usually English, math, speech, humanities and social science requirements). This heavier load in classes with larger enrollments may have led to lower GPAs the second semester. However, after the drop in the GPA at the end of the second semester, the GPA went up steadily with students' final cumulative GPA being the highest one. Grades received by transfer or returning students during their first semester were generally higher (3.13 GPA) than those received by new freshman, or by students who entered UAF with less than 30 credits (2.85 GPA).

The patterns in the students' GPAs suggest that the majority of students in this group were not stellar performers, but they were steady, serious, hard working and persistent students—and their grades were certainly "respectable." In many universities in which minority students are enrolled, it has become a frequent practice to focus only on those students whose grades place them at one or the other end of the GPA continuum—students who have very high GPAs and those who have very low ones. This tendency often causes individuals and institutions to ignore the large majority of students who are in between. The needs of, and rewards for, what one counselor referred to as the "pluggers"—those who continue to plug away each semester—are frequently overlooked because the spotlight shines only on those students who do very well or very poorly. Most of the students in this study were pluggers and survivors.

Comments

According to transcript and interview data presented in this chapter, it is evident that a very complex set of interrelated factors influenced students' experiences and performances during their first years at UAF. Some of these are factors that influence all students, while others are particular to Alaska Native students and/or students who have come from small rural communities. It is evident that, for the students in this study, the first years at UAF were significantly influenced by high school and prior work opportunities; level of support from families and communities; availability of dependable and safe housing, and childcare; adequate financial assistance; access to a "university significant other," and of course, individual student strengths.

It is also evident from a review of the student data that nearly all students utilized, and relied upon, many of the 27 Alaska Native programs and student support services described in Chapter 5. In fact, it is hard to imagine what the first year experiences of most students might have been like had these not been available. The programs and services used most were those that gave evidence of respecting the Native perspective and worldview that students brought to the university setting. These programs were essential in helping to provide a first year environment where students could learn the rules for succeeding in "life on the other side" without having to make unreasonable compromises.

CHAPTER 7

BEING A NATIVE STUDENT AND BECOMING A TEACHER

Chapter 6 provided an overview of the first year experiences of students in this study group. From the data reviewed, it is evident that nearly all students did encounter difficult and demanding circumstances in this year, but they were able to develop a variety of strategies that allowed them to complete successfully the first two critical semesters and move ahead with their college education. In this chapter the focus moves to students' experiences during their "middle" years and finally to their final and professional year in the public schools.

The chapter begins with a review of students' comments about being a Native student on campus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. In one interview question students were asked whether or not they felt their experience at UAF had been different because they were an Alaska Native, and a small number of the comments in this section came from their responses to this question. However, the large majority of student reflections on this issue were initiated by students themselves and were offered as responses to a wide variety of other questions in the interview.

Being a Native Student at UAF

In the course of the interviews, students frequently commented on the many ways in which their identity as an Alaska Native affected their experiences as students at UAF. Their comments reflect, once again, the diversity within the group of students that UAF refers to as "its Native student population." The comments also reflect some of the soul searching that students went through in their effort to establish an identity with which they could feel comfortable, and which would also allow them to successfully move through the university system.

The reflections of students who grew up in larger regional or urban settings, or came from families of mixed heritage, offer insight into the ambivalence some students experienced about how to best fit in at UAF.

- It was almost harder for me [being from an urban area] than for the kids that come directly from the villages. I think they have a really good sense of identity and then they kind of have to plow through everything else. Whereas for us [urban students] the identity thing is really hard because you have to start really balancing the two . . . I experimented and plunged right into the Native community, and tried to see myself solely as a Native person, and that didn't really make me happy, whereas before, identifying with the non-Native community wasn't satisfying either. So, I tried to bridge the two—or really, not even bridge—it was more like trying to walk on two different planks . . . and this was a big challenge. [I found out] when you're dealing with human nature, society, and culture it's almost like you're dealing with two different icebergs or two different plates with fluid underneath.
- I think I would have done better if I was more Native or more White. . . . I guess I was in this in-between stage where I didn't really know how I came across as an individual . . . It's different for me because I don't really fit in either category . . . it's like, frustrating. I don't really fit in either group because of how I look and how I talk, and how I don't talk and how I don't look . . . trying to deal with this takes a lot of energy.

In the statements of many village students, however, there was little ambiguity and a strong sense of pride about being Native and about being from a rural community. Statements such as the following were common—especially from students who grew up in smaller, rural and more traditional villages where Native languages were used and where subsistence activities were important and integral to the life of the community.

- I am proud of who I am, of my heritage, my culture and my language. I am not a city person and I'm not embarrassed to say that. . . . I'm more comfortable in the villages.
- I am full-blooded Eskimo and I am a fluent speaker of my first language and of English. . . . I grew up in a traditional life style where the values and beliefs of my culture were taught.
- I am an Alaska Athabaskan Indian, and my subsistence lifestyle is very important to me and to my family.

Although virtually all of the students from rural areas had experiences in cross-cultural settings through their schooling, job and/or travel experiences, most had not yet experienced being a minority in a large bureaucratic institution. Students talked about turning to programs and individuals at UAF to help them sort through these issues.

- All of my friends that first year were White and it took me awhile to get over that feeling of inferiority because I was Native. When I found RSS, they helped me to realize that it wasn't a bad thing to be a Native person—that I had every reason to be proud of being a Native person.

- I had not really identified with being Native before I came to UAF, but I found my support network through some of the Native groups here at UAF.

- My identity now is very much wrapped up within the Native community. Not only with the people where I'm from, but with all Native people in Alaska. I learned up at RSS that Native students have many of the same challenges. . . . We're dealing with the same other culture . . . we're very family-oriented, we're very village-oriented, and our languages are important to us.

- Sometimes in the dorms non-Native students would be lewd and outright racist and call us "salmon crunchers" and stuff like that . . . .this scared a lot of students who had just come from villages where they hadn't had to deal with stuff like that. . . It was good we had RSS people to talk to about this.

Students described some classroom situations where they felt that people responded to them primarily on the basis of their Nativeness. Instructors and other students talked down, talked louder, had lower expectations, or simply ignored them because they were Native students.

- In some classes I was treated differently because I was Native, and whenever possible I got out of those classes right away.

- One of my professors had really low expectations for us and he expected the Native students to not know anything . . . I mean he taught us like we were elementary students . . . he had an attitude.

- A lot of people [at UAF] felt that we as Alaska Native people had special privileges because we had scholarships and different things . . . and I felt like they treated us differently because of this.

Several students discovered that teachers did not expect to see Native students enrolled in their upper level classes and this message was relayed to them in both direct and indirect ways. Others talked about the uneasiness they felt when they were asked to speak publicly in their classes on behalf of "the Native community." Some described this kind of spotlighting as not only uncomfortable, but also culturally inappropriate.

- I was always really aware of when I was the only Native in the class. If it was a really big class where they didn't call on us and we didn't have to get together in groups, I didn't really mind it. In one small class where I was the only Native, I didn't really mind it through because there was another minority student there.

- I felt that people in my classes were judging me all the time. I felt that everybody was looking at me . . . like are you sure you're in the right class? But I kept my feelings inside. I was the only Native in several of my classes.

- There were times in my classes when the instructors were talking about Native issues and the other students would all look at me and expect me to speak for all Natives since I was the only one in the class. It was especially uncomfortable when they talked about things I didn't know how to explain in terms that they would clearly understand.

The students who spoke English-as-a-second language talked about when and where and why they used their first language.

- I feel more comfortable with my language than with English and so I used it [at UAF] whenever I was with people who spoke my language.
- I felt competent in writing in English when I started UAF, but not in speaking. I was self conscious about using *he* and *she* because we don't have terms for he and she in our language.
- When I was with another person who spoke Yup'ik we'd always use it if the situation was comfortable . . . in our dorm rooms and at RSS. I wouldn't use it when I was in an elevator or the cafeteria or some other place where most of the people around me spoke English as their first language.
- It was actually great to be around so many people who spoke Yup'ik [when I would go home at Christmas and in the summer]. I didn't notice what I missed until I had to do without it [at UAF].
- I was playing basketball at the gym with someone from home and we were speaking in our language while we were planning our strategy for passing and shooting. One of the guys on the other side told us to stop speaking in a foreign language because this was America. . . . I told them that the language I was now speaking to them with was foreign and the language I had been speaking with my friend was native to this country . . . and I told them that we have every right to speak our own language.

Although most of the 50 students did speak English as their first language, several used interaction patterns that were not typical of American urban dialects. Like many Alaska Native people, the communication styles of some students in the group were characterized by the use of slightly different intonation, pause or rhythm patterns; a greater reliance on non-verbal communication; more utilization of storytelling and indirectness; and sometimes, grammatical, syntactic or vocabulary differences. Students experienced different types of problems because of these communication differences. Some, as is evident in the student's comment below, involved personal relationships, whereas others (described later in the chapter) caused misunderstandings when students were in the public school classrooms.

- I had lots of non-Native friends, but even these people [who were my friends] related to me only as long as I related to them in a non-Native interactional style . . . when I brought my Native friends around who had a real traditional style it was very tense because they really didn't connect with one another—it was pretty weird.

When asked directly in the interview if they thought they had been treated any differently because they were Native students, a small number of students—almost always the younger ones—said they felt they had been treated the same as everyone else at UAF. Students who said, "I always just felt like a student—not like a *Native* student," attributed the problems they had encountered at UAF to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, and not to differences based on their Nativeness.

- I don't think I was treated different . . . but I always *felt* different . . . there were many times and many places where I just didn't feel comfortable being an Alaska Native at UAF.

In addition to using some of the UAF Alaska Native programs and personnel to help them deal with issues of discrimination, students described some of the personal "survival" strategies they developed.

- Lots of students leave UAF because of prejudice but I looked at it this way . . . I'd show them that I was stronger, and I just wouldn't be friends with people who were prejudiced. I realized that when you look for it [prejudice] you'll always find it. . . . If people didn't want to be my friend, then that was okay.

- When I did see something that I felt might be discriminatory I just said "hmm" and then I just tried to let it roll over.

- Some advice I'd give students is that there's a certain amount of institutionalizing that everybody has to go through, so that you'll be able to work within the institution. But there's a fine line between giving up who you are and what you stand for, and figuring out how to go along with what they [people in the university] want.

- I had an upper division English teacher who said my writing was horrible because it was too circular and not linear enough. I knew my writing wasn't horrible. . . . I finally just bought into her style because I wanted to graduate.

- In order to make people more comfortable [who don't know how to relate to me because I'm part Native], I've started telling them they should imagine that I've drawn an invisible line starting at my forehead going all the way down to my toes, and my right side is the White half and my left side is the Native half and they can talk to whatever half they're more comfortable with.

- There's a very fine line between making it and not making it in college and I think that it's the packaging part that makes the big difference. If you don't really know how to package yourself, you're not going to make it. . . . I had to decide whether or not I was willing to package myself the way UAF wanted me to.

Students' comments make it evident that many of them spent a great deal of time and energy learning about "life on the other side," and an equal amount of effort attempting to figure out how to package themselves so that they could survive without having to become an opposite of themselves. In the next section, we will look at some of the people and programs they turned to in an effort to achieve this balance.

The Middle Years

Students' "middle" university years were busy and intense, but for most in this group, this in-between period was not as stressful or as demanding as the first and final years. Although the UAF teacher education program is theoretically a four year (eight semester) program, very few students ever complete it in that time period. The average time for students in this study group was five and one-half years.

During the middle years (i.e. second, third and fourth), most students in the group confirmed that education was the right major for them and a small number examined other options. They also became more involved in campus activities, got jobs on campus, and spent a lot of time studying. The majority of the students in this group took at least a semester-long break from their university studies, and all students continued to use their families and communities for support.

Finding Good Courses

All of the students interviewed were anxious to talk about the kinds of courses they enjoyed the most and what, in their opinion, made a course "good" or "bad." When asked specifically about the kinds of courses they least enjoyed, nearly all students, without hesitation, offered a variation on the response, "I don't like boring classes!" When asked to elaborate, the following comments were typical.

- It was so awful when the teacher just read notes and told us what was in the chapters we'd already read.
- I really didn't like the classes where everything in the lectures and the tests came right out of a boring textbook.

When asked to share ideas about the kinds of courses they had learned the most from, their responses were more varied.

- I liked classes where the teacher didn't talk down to us.
- I liked classes where it wasn't all lecture—where they would let us break up into groups and talk to each other.
- I had one teacher who knew my name even though it was a big class. He even called me by my first name which was something that none of my professors had ever done at the other college I went to . . . Knowing that there was somebody that knew my name encouraged me . . . I tried so hard in that class and I really wanted to get an A because he knew who I was. He saw something in me and he encouraged it.
- When instructors used my name and asked how I felt about something it was like a hook . . . It was a compliment to think that they wanted to hear what I thought about something.

There were several comments about the advantages of small classes.

- I just don't like big classes . . . you don't get to know your instructor and it's hard to let them know you.
- I like it when I feel like the instructor recognizes me, and I'm not just another name.
- I had a tough time with the big classes because I was too intimidated to go and ask for help. . . . I thought that maybe the other students knew everything and that I was the only one who wasn't on top of it.

While reflecting on the courses that had been most meaningful for them, students made similar comments about the characteristics of those whom they considered good teachers.

- I really liked the teachers who made the classes interesting and exciting.
- The teachers that were the best [in high school and at UAF] were the ones that had worked with other Native people or other minority people in the past—that makes a big difference.
- I learned a lot from instructors who had been [classroom] teachers before.
- It seems like most of the teachers that I thought were good were people who had cross-cultural experiences—maybe it was because they had a sense that our communication styles are different.

When I asked students what they would do if they were having trouble in a class, their responses were very similar.

- I would always talk to professors, and sometimes I would pretty much demand that they help me. . . . That's one thing my parents taught me that really pulled me through. I know a lot of kids that would never go talk to their professors. My father always said that you've got to have confidence. . . . Once you've lost your confidence you've lost everything.

- I was never uncomfortable with going up to a professor and stating this is where I'm at and what are you asking me to do? Having been a teacher aide I realized what the role of a teacher should be and so I wasn't intimidated going up and asking for help. This doesn't mean I always got it though.

- Once I have met professors it is easy for me to talk to them, and I would go and try to see them and ask questions. I've had friends who said to me "You went to talk to the professor?" I told them that I had to or I might not have gotten through the class or I might not have been able to get a good grade.

- When one of my professors told the whole class that my writing was rather simplistic I decided that I would go to the head of the department to tell him I was dropping the class and why. After talking with the department head for a long time and seeing how much he believed in my ability to do the work, I realized that if someone [in his position] believed in me that much then I would not drop the class. [When I asked the student how she had the courage to go to the department head she responded that]. . . It never crossed my mind that students couldn't do that.

There was strong consensus about the value of approaching and talking directly to one's instructors out of class, and this strategy obviously worked well for several students, but only if the instructors were available. One student summarized the comments of several others when she said that,

- Some of the professors here just aren't people-oriented people. We had to spend a lot of time just trying to hunt the profs down.

It was apparent from the interviews that students and some of their professors were often working at cross-purposes, and what was best for students was not necessarily in the best interest of professors. Since spending time with students is not a recognized part of the criteria for advancement within the university setting, some faculty felt they could not give a high priority to meeting with students out of class.

When I asked students other questions about courses and places to study, several said that for most of their serious individual study they relied heavily on the library. It provided a quiet place, as well as access to materials and to computers if the ones in RSS were already being used. Some also studied in dorm rooms, but usually only if they lived in a single room. Students who were parents studied at home late at night or during the day if their children were in school.

Seventy-five percent of the students interviewed specifically mentioned the RSS student area on the 5th floor of the Gruening Building as a place they went to on a regular basis (many went every day) to meet with friends and/or advisors and have coffee, use the computers for class assignments, and study with other students.

- I remember one time when five of us were taking a class together and we were studying about the "zone of proximal development." I was having trouble understanding it and so we were all arguing like crazy about this concept . . . and we even got so loud that people [at RSS] finally had to tell us to be quiet. . . . RSS gave us a great place to study and to learn.

Most students reported that they continued to see their RSS advisor even after they began working directly with an advisor in their major academic department because of the comprehensiveness of RSS advising services and because RSS advisors could often arrange for small groups of students to take classes together and form study groups. Some students also reported finding it difficult to arrange times to meet with the advisor in their academic department (perhaps because at UAF, as in nearly all research-oriented universities, undergraduate academic advising is a time-consuming task that is not rewarded when decisions are made related to promotion or tenure). Students' comments clearly indicated though that accurate and responsive advising was critical to their success. For some students in this group, RSS advisors functioned as surrogates for academic department faculty advisors.

According to many students RSS was frequently the only location on campus where they could feel comfortable enough to really "be themselves" and find advisors and other students who were able to understand and respond to their questions and needs in a wholistic manner. It served as a locus in which they could integrate their academic, personal, social, and cultural worlds, and one in which they were able to find understanding and support in balancing the expectations and demands of their families, friends and communities with the often contradictory expectations and demands of UAF.

Alaska Native and Rural Courses

Although few options are available for elective courses in the elementary or secondary education programs, when students did have a choice many in this group chose to take courses from the departments of Alaska Native Languages, Alaska Native Studies or Rural Development. A total of 38 students took an Alaska Native Studies course that was not required (until 1990 all Bachelor of Education students were required to take one Alaska Native Studies course). The most frequently chosen courses were ANS 250, Current Alaska Native Leadership Perspectives (3 credits); ANS 401, Cultural Knowledge of Native Elders (3 credits); and ANS 160, Alaska Native Dance (1 or 2 credits). Some chose these courses even when they knew they would not be able to use them to meet the requirements in their major.

- I liked these courses because they helped me to understand myself, my culture, and my language.
- I took these courses because they were real to me.
- I highly valued the Rural Development courses. They were vital for helping me to learn to work with the entire community.

Students chose to enroll in Alaska Native language courses to fulfill humanities requirements and to learn more about the language from their home region. Nineteen out of the 50 students enrolled in three or more credits of the Alaska Native language courses that are designed for both speakers and non-speakers. Seven Yup'ik-speaking students took Yup'ik courses in an effort to become more literate in their language and to study grammatical analysis. Five Inupiat students (who came from villages where several adults spoke Inupiaq fluently) and who themselves spoke their language with varying levels of proficiency took Inupiaq courses. Two students from the Koyukon Athabaskan area took Koyukon classes, and an Aleut student enrolled in an Alutiaaq language course. Although these students knew little of their language they came from communities where the elders still spoke it.

Based on students' comments, the Alaska Native language and culture courses and the Rural Development courses appeared to help students connect theory to practice, and taking these course provided them with opportunities to examine some of the ways in which their personal lives intersected with their evolving professional interests and responsibilities. Since these were credit courses that could be used in some instances to satisfy degree requirements, they also served as a means of legitimating Native knowledge and Native ways of teaching and learning.

Declaring a Major

Although research literature is inconclusive, a common belief regarding university student retention is that students who declare their major early are more likely to be directed and focused and will therefore complete their degree program sooner than those who declare later (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). As discussed in Chapter 6, most of the students in this group of 50 went to college specifically because they wanted to be teachers. Twenty-two students declared education (or the specific academic area in which they would teach at a secondary level) as their major when they entered UAF. Fourteen students entered on an "undeclared" status, 4 entered as non-degree students, and when students in these two groups officially declared their major or minor, education was their first choice. Six students (all entering UAF shortly after graduating from high school) declared a major in business or accounting, and 4 students chose other majors (e.g. biology, engineering, journalism).

Although I gathered information on the dates when students declared their majors, the information is of limited use because many students were encouraged not to declare a major until after they had spent at least a year at UAF. Since no benefits were to be gained from making this decision prior to entering UAF, and no penalties would accrue to those who enrolled in an "undeclared" status, many students chose this option. Regardless of a student's academic interests or choice of major, there was little variation among the courses that students took during their first year at UAF. Students who declared other majors (prior to entering UAF) reported that after taking the introductory course in the field they discovered it was not what they had expected, not a major they would be able to utilize in a rural area, boring, or too hard.

- Journalism just wasn't what I expected.
- I didn't start in education right away—I thought about business. But I always felt like I would be a teacher because my Mom and my uncle both had been pre-school teachers, and my grandparents had come to our school to help out with Native activities.
- I changed from business to education because I found out there weren't very many jobs for people with business degrees in my region.

All of the 32 students in this group of 50 who received their certification for elementary teaching did so by completing the requirements for a Bachelors of Education degree in elementary education. (Although it is possible for students to receive their elementary certification by completing a minor in education, few students at UAF choose this option.)

The 18 students who received secondary certification had more degree and certification options available to them. Five secondary students minored in education and majored in the discipline in which they wanted to teach (3 in English, 1 in History, 1 in Political Science, 1 in business education, and 2 of these 5 students graduated with majors in two separate subject areas). The thirteen remaining secondary students chose to receive a Bachelors of Education degree with an integrated major/minor in Language Arts/Humanities (4 students), Social Sciences (6 students) and Math/Sciences (2 students). These interdisciplinary degree options are specifically designed to prepare students to teach in Alaska's small rural high schools where teachers are responsible for teaching multiple subjects across multiple grade levels.

Why Teach?

Although students in this group chose to be teachers for a variety of reasons, there were two general ones cited most frequently: (1) the desire to be in a profession that would allow them to make a contribution to their community and help their people; and (2) the desire to have a profession that would allow them to live and work in their home region.

For many students, the decision to teach was initiated by their own experiences in the public school system, and for others it was prompted and/or confirmed by the teaching and learning experiences they had while they were employed in the schools in their communities. Students' work experiences in classrooms occurred either (1) prior to their initial enrollment at UAF, (2) during the time when they "stopped out" of college for an extended period, or (3) during the periods of time when they took a short break from their studies to return to their home communities for one or two semesters. Out of the group of 50 students, 26 were employed in public schools before and/or during their teacher education program at UAF. In addition to the jobs in their schools, 22 students from this group worked in education-related jobs on the UAF campus.

Students' reasons for becoming teachers also included the influence of their own elementary and secondary teachers, the goal of maintaining their Native language through teaching, and students' desire to remain in a rural area. Several indicated that their own positive or negative experiences in schools prompted and/or confirmed their decision to teach. The influence of good teachers and good schooling experiences is evident in these comments.

- I wanted to follow in the footsteps of the teachers I had in my school at home.
- In junior high I had an inspirational teacher who was very enthusiastic about teaching and who treated each student as an individual. She inspired me to become a teacher.
- My early educational experiences with teachers were positive and I was inspired to follow in their footsteps. I wanted to set an example to my students and show them that they can be whatever they want to be in life.
- Some of my better teachers reinforced my wishes to teach. In rural classrooms, the best teachers are the ones that are both challenging and nice. In rural classrooms there is a need for teachers who are not only willing to get along in the classroom and community, but are also willing to push the students harder so that they are better prepared for college, vocational school, or even a job.

Students' memories of the experiences and consequences of having unprepared, culturally-insensitive, poor teachers also contributed to their decision to teach.

- I have had a lot of horrible experiences with bad teachers. I have had some impatient, impolite and literally impossible teachers who have managed to make me feel pretty low about myself. I want to prevent this type of bad teacher behavior from continuing. I think that we need better teachers in Alaska, and especially in rural Alaska. I would like to be one of the better teachers. I want the children that I will someday be teaching to leave my classroom with high self esteem. I want to prevent the wounds that I have received and make kids feel good about themselves.

- I chose teaching because I want to see Native children advance and succeed. I believe that kids in my community can be helped to see alternatives. The current education of Native children in my area added fuel to my determination to become a teacher. I feel that the majority of Alaska Native children are choosing not to go to school because the encouragement is not there. When I become a teacher I think I might be able to help change this situation. Also, I just like working with kids.

- Because I had subbed at home I knew about all of the problems that teachers go through, and I felt that I would be able to do things differently than some of the non-Native teachers I worked with. All of them had come from urban places outside of Alaska. They just didn't know where our students were coming from or what kind of encouragement they needed. We have so many new teachers coming all the time that don't know how to motivate our kids. I also want to be a role model. Many students and young people that I talk to at home think they aren't smart enough to attend college and graduate. Also, I don't drink alcohol and so I would like to be a model for them in this area too.

- There just wasn't enough consistency in my own education because teachers came and went all the time in our village. I want to provide some consistency for the kids at home.

- I saw a need for our community to have teachers who really have a vested interest in our children.

Students who had grown up in urban areas also remembered negative schooling experiences.

- I wanted to extend a hand back to others to help them upon the educational road. I remember well the terrible struggle it was for me, and the hurt I felt because I was not quite like the other kids.

- I can really identify with kids who are tracked [in school] only on the basis of their appearance . . . because I was too.

Students who spoke Yup'ik as their first language were motivated by a desire to help maintain and integrate their Native language and culture into the everyday life of the schools in their areas.

- At the time that I started going to school, I didn't know how to speak English. I decided to go into education just so my niece and then other children—people who speak my first language—wouldn't have to go through what I did. When I teach I'll probably have to teach in English, but if the students don't understand I'll explain it to them in our language.

- I did not want children to go through what I did when I started going to school. I didn't speak any English and none of the teachers spoke Yup'ik.

- I'm concerned about our language dying. I want to be a teacher where I can use Yup'ik in the classroom.

- I want to teach children using my language and be able to encourage children to learn about and use our Native language in the classroom. And even though I've found that it can be more convenient to live in an urban area, I know I want to teach in an area of Alaska where my Native language and culture are alive. I'll only teach in a district that supports bilingual education.

Students' decisions were certainly influenced by job opportunities, and in small rural areas there are only a very limited number of professional options. Students also commented on liking the flexibility that a teaching degree afforded them.

- I want to live in a rural area and this [teaching] assures me that I'll have that option.
- I decided to become a teacher because I could see I was needed and because I knew I could make a contribution. I knew that teaching would give me the opportunity to help my people and maintain my Native subsistence lifestyle because I would still be able to fish in the summer.
- The district gave me a scholarship and guaranteed me a job after I graduated.
- If I get a teaching degree I'll be able to get a job at home, and later on I'll be able to move to Fairbanks or Anchorage and try to get a job there if I want to.

It is clear that for many of the group, a teaching degree offered the possibility of making a meaningful contribution to their communities (i.e. their people), and the opportunity to have a "transportable" profession that would allow them to remain in a rural area if they chose to do so.

For 26 students in this group the decision to become a teacher was initiated, influenced, or confirmed by the opportunities they had to work in schools in their community—as bilingual teachers, as teacher's aides, or as substitute teachers. Others had worked in elementary classrooms when they were high school students through specially-designed tutoring or teacher-helper programs.

- I had never planned to be a teacher, but after subbing for two years I realized that was what I wanted to do.
- After being an aide I learned that I was capable of being a regular classroom teacher.
- I was a teacher's aide for four years. I thoroughly enjoyed my job and I was always mistaken for a teacher. Aiding was the most comfortable and rewarding of all the jobs I had—the social aspect of it, the joys of seeing learning take place, observing the different ways that individual students learned, etc. I also found out through being an aide what age group I preferred to work with.

- I found that I was actually learning about myself while I was a teacher's aide. . . . I was actually seeing students getting excited about learning. They were having similar experiences to what I used to have while I was in school. I realized that as a teacher I could serve as a role model and if I worked hard I could see things come to fruition. I also learned that teaching would not be a boring job!
- I had never ever imagined being a teacher. But when I started to work for my school district, they asked if I would be willing to take some college courses. I said that I was too old to begin a program to become a teacher, and then they asked me how old I would be if I *didn't* take courses . . . so, I started taking education courses and I got hooked.

These classroom opportunities gave students a chance to develop skills, expertise and confidence by participating in real teaching and learning environments, and they provided a realistic means for choosing or confirming their career choice. They also provided students with the chance to demonstrate their classroom competence in the school system in which several hoped to be hired. In addition to their in-school, more formal educational experiences, many students in this group also had valuable teaching and learning opportunities through the part-time jobs they held on the UAF campus.

Campus Jobs

During the third and fourth years of study at UAF 22 of the students in the group of 50 (almost always students who did not have parenting responsibilities) got jobs on campus that provided not only a paycheck, but an opportunity to be meaningfully involved in a variety of work experiences. They worked in several different capacities but the majority were employed by one of the Alaska Native programs or services, either Rural Student Services (RSS), the Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI) high school bridging program or by the special Native-affiliated residence hall known as NANA House. Others tutored for other campus programs, worked in UAF residence halls or with the UAF student government.

Nine students worked for RSS as peer counselors or academic tutors for other Native and rural students. They assisted new students in learning about the university system, provided tutoring for classes, and helped sponsor various social activities.

- While I was a peer counselor I had to be a good role model because I couldn't advise other students to study and be prepared for classes if I wasn't doing that myself. . . . [I discovered that] it wasn't always easy to deal with students who wanted answers instead of advice.
- I had a job tutoring in math and I also helped people in the dorms with their homework. . . . I really enjoyed it.
- I got hired to do tutoring here [at UAF], and I found that I loved doing it.

Six students from the group worked as staff members for the Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI) during the summer months in positions that ranged from dorm counselor to recreation coordinator to residence program supervisor.

- After working with students in the RAHI program, I knew that I wanted to be a teacher.

In these RAHI roles students had responsibility for a wide range of academic, social and administrative functions. In addition to the six week summer program, their RAHI associations extended throughout the academic year with a variety of formal and informal events that brought previous RAHI students, staff and faculty together. Having a regular RAHI newsletter, an annual fall reunion for RAHI alumni, instructors and friends, and an 800 telephone number available with which former RAHI students could call the RAHI program at UAF contributed to the development of a sense of connection and community among students who shared past experiences and who had similar current interests. The comments from students about what they learned, while living with a group of 40 high school juniors and seniors for an intensive six week period and at the same time working closely with RAHI faculty members, made clear that these experiences were an invaluable training ground for their later work in formal classroom settings.

Six students from the group also served as resident advisors at NANA house, the regional dorm for Inupiat students from the Northwest Arctic area, and a small number of students held positions in the UAF student government or in UAF residence halls.

- I applied for the job [in the dorm] not only because I thought I was qualified, but because I felt there was a need for some minority students in these positions. Alaska Native students needed representation and some role models. I enjoyed the position and learned a lot about understanding and working with many different people.

For a brief period the Education Department hired undergraduate teacher education students to serve as academic tutors and advisors for Alaska Native students who were enrolled in education classes, and 3 students worked in that capacity.

- At first I did it for the money, but I continued with it because I liked getting to know how the system worked, and I liked getting to know the education faculty and staff.
- I loved tutoring [for the education classes] because when you have to teach someone else you have to know the material really well, and you begin to have a passion for it.

Several students were members of two academic clubs, and they attended state or national conventions as delegates for the American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES) or the Alaska Native Education Student Association (ANESA). Many also served as volunteers for the annual Festival of Native Arts—an event that brings people from rural areas throughout the state to Fairbanks in February for a week of Native dancing, singing and other festivities.

It is likely that students were hired for these jobs *because* of their demonstrated interest and ability in the field of education. It is also likely that these jobs (like those in the schools) were important in helping students develop the kinds of skills and the confidence that would be useful to them later in formal and non-formal classroom and community teaching and learning settings. In addition, the jobs provided students with the opportunity to gain valuable insights about UAF as an institution. The jobs, in effect, served as a nexus in which students' academic, social and financial needs could come together. As such they offered another avenue where students could integrate several components of their campus lives.

Taking a Break

Ninety-five percent of the students in this group of 50 were full-time students during the time they were on the Fairbanks campus. Few students (and this is typical of most Alaska

Native students attending the Fairbanks campus of UAF) had the option of attending on a part-time basis because financial aid and university student housing are available only for full-time students (i.e. students who are enrolled for 12 credit hours—usually four courses). The students who did complete some of their studies on a part-time basis were students who had lived in Fairbanks previously and had housing, a car, and usually a job.

The average number of semesters that non-transfer students in this group spent on the UAF campus, not counting summer sessions, was 11—equivalent to five and one-half school years. The time most students spent getting their degrees was not what has become the mythical four-year period that continues to be used as a base of reference for many higher education programs and services. There are several explanations for the longer time period for students in this group: the structure and course demands of the UAF teacher education program, taking classes that could not count toward their degree, working while attending school, and the demands of parenting.

Nineteen students enrolled at UAF during summers, and the most common pattern was for students to attend one six-week session in which they would take two classes. Out of the group of 50, 19 students completed all of their degree work on the Fairbanks campus, and 17 took at least one class, and often several, through one of the university's rural campuses, while the remaining students transferred from other institutions.

Like their counterparts in other institutions in the United States today, the majority of students in this group took a break while pursuing their degrees. Some took breaks that lasted several years, but most took breaks that were one semester or one year in length. Nine students completed their degree without taking any break. As 1 of the 9 said, "I thought about it many times, but I was afraid I wouldn't be able to find a job [during the break] or afraid that I might not come back."

Students took breaks for a variety of reasons—the primary ones being the need to recharge themselves, to help or to reconnect with family members and community, and to get themselves "mentally prepared" for methods and student teaching. Others took breaks because of the needs of their children and/or spouse, and/or because of financial reasons. Nearly all students returned to their rural villages during their breaks and almost all held part time jobs, with most working in the schools in their communities. Almost unanimously students said that the break served its intended purpose. They also discovered that they missed their friends at UAF and some aspects of the campus environment, and many commented that their families strongly encouraged them to return. When they returned it was with a renewed sense of purpose, focus and energy.

Leaving campus due to "the burn-out factor" was cited most frequently as a reason for taking a break.

- I took a semester off because I was getting burnt out. I went home and held two part-time jobs. This was good because I realized how much I missed school and attending classes. When I returned I was refreshed and ready to continue.
- After my first year here I took a long break because I didn't know what the hell I was doing here. My decision to stay home was probably the best decision I ever made because I found myself and I got more focused and figured out what I wanted out of my life and out of my college experience. I worked all the time I was at home. Some jobs were in the school and some weren't.
- I was burned out . . . I didn't care about grades or anything. So after three years I went home and I subbed in my school. But I felt like I was too old to be living with my parents, and I felt guilty because I didn't feel they should be taking care of me anymore. I also missed my friends and Fairbanks.
- I took off for one semester . . . I was depressed and burnt out and felt alienated so I decided to "run away" and go home where I at least had a set identity. I worked in the school, and the kids were great—they wanted me to go back to college so I could become their *real* teacher.
- I realized that I was burnt out and had no more energy so I went home and it was a real reality check. I realized there was nothing for me to do in my home town without my degree.

It was also not unusual for students to take a break just before they began what they expected to be a busy and demanding final year.

- I had personal problems and I had signed up for too much at one time . . . I just needed to get away. I ended up staying out about two years with only methods and student teaching left.
- I took a break right before I began my last year—before my methods and student teaching. I volunteered in my school at home and then got hired to sub. It was a good way to build my self confidence.

Other reasons for taking breaks included the need, or desire, to spend more time with their families in their home communities.

- One semester I stayed home to learn more about my Native culture. I realized though when I was at home that without a degree there wasn't really anything to do . . . and I also missed my friends at UAF.
- I needed to take care of my daughter, and this turned out to be good because it gave me a chance to grow up and become more focused on what I wanted to do.
- I took long breaks and went home each time. The first time I went home for a whole year because my parents and grandparents needed help. I worked as a sub the second time and found that I was interested in teaching . . . I almost wish that I hadn't started college right after high school because I wasn't as serious then. All of the breaks helped me to get a better focus on my studies.

While students were away from campus, advisors in RSS coordinated efforts to write and send group letters to make sure students did not lose contact with friends on campus. Large pieces of colored paper would be placed on one of the walls at RSS, each with the name of a student who had taken a break and left Fairbanks for a semester or a year. Students' friends and RSS advisors in Fairbanks would write notes to them on these sheets of paper and then they would be sent to the students once or twice during the semester. Several students also kept connected with instructors and advisors on the Fairbanks campus through the use of the UAF computer mail system, and several enrolled in one or two classes through the off-campus teacher education program (X-CED) or through the UAF rural campus in their region.

Maintaining Family Contact

Almost without exception, students talked about the importance of maintaining contact with, and getting the latest news about, their immediate families, their extended families, and their home communities—even after they had made it through their freshman year. For many, the contacts with family and community in rural areas occurred through long weekly phone calls.

- I'm very close to my mom and to my grandparents and I would talk to them at least every week.
- I was so happy to have parents who would accept my [collect] phone calls.

- I called home every weekend—always after church. I always called my parents and *sometimes I'd call my sisters [who weren't living at home].*

- I was so lonely during my first Thanksgiving here. If I hadn't been able to call my family, it would have been awful.

- I looked forward to being able to talk Yup'ik with my family each week.

Many parents sent "care packages" that almost always included Native foods; one student described receiving video tapes; and some talked about other ways that the community remembered them.

- I really missed being away from my village—especially during festivals. I would call home to see how things had been . . . to see what songs had been sung. Sometimes my family would videotape some of it for me.

- The postmaster in our village put little encouraging notes on the mail that was forwarded to me.

The phone calls served several purposes for students: they could get news from home, talk about their lives at UAF, get verification that their families were concerned about them, and hear on a weekly basis that someone was proud of their university accomplishments. Since phones were not available in many Alaska villages until 1980, and since mail planes in the past flew on a less frequent basis than today, college students who left their villages several years ago found it much more difficult to maintain close connections with their families. Based on what students in this study said about their extensive use of the telephone to talk with members of their families, it is clear that this connection to the villages has played an important role in sustaining rural Alaska students through the isolation they frequently experience at college. Perhaps we have previously overlooked one of the most important factors that is related to the increase in the number of Alaska Native students who are successfully completing college today!

Some students from rural areas went home at times other than Christmas. The most frequent reason for traveling home was to attend funerals or memorial potlatches, but when some students had extra money, they would go home on three or four day weekends for community events.

The close attachment to families and communities was strong, even for those students who had suffered through parents' alcoholism or been victims of child abuse. In fact, for some students the dysfunctionalism they had experienced at home was the factor that helped them to keep their focus and direction—they wanted to be able to not only assure themselves of a better life, *but* they wanted to be in a position to offer help to their families. For some there was also a strong sense of responsibility toward younger brothers and sisters and nieces and nephews, and a commitment to provide them with a less turbulent childhood than they themselves had experienced. For almost all students, their strong family relationships caused an almost paradoxical situation: on the one hand the commitment and strong sense of responsibility to family and community served as a reason to remain at UAF; on the other hand the oftentimes intense desire to actually be at home with their family and community members was a reason to want to leave.

For many students the group gatherings in the lounge at RSS provided a way to help them connect their campus and home lives, and they provided a sense of membership in a special community on the UAF campus. One of the events mentioned most frequently were the almost-monthly potlucks at RSS that were co-sponsored with the Department of Alaska Native Studies in honor of the Alaska Native elders who were in residence at the time. Native food for the potlucks came from across the state in the form of gifts from students' parents, Native non-profit corporations, and from the RSS staff. A typical menu might include any of the following: moose, beaver, seal meat, seal oil, muktuk, all kinds of fresh and smoked fish, herring eggs, and akutaq—a dessert made with wild berries. In spite of limited physical space, limited food budgets and no kitchen facilities, these potlucks often served between 200 and 300 people. Students commented that they, and often their spouse and children, seldom missed one of these events.

- The potlucks were something I always participated in . . . even when I was too busy, too pregnant and too poor [to do other things].
- I really liked attending the RSS potlucks. . . . It was a fun time. We could see everybody, we were happy and together, and we could all forget about our studies for a short time.

Students also indicated that they liked going to the potlucks because they were the only place on campus (and for some the only place in Fairbanks) where they could see and visit with children and elders, and thus it felt a little bit like "being at home."

The Professional Year

It is apparent that because of the extensive experience that many students already had in schools in their communities, they were well aware of the demands and the rewards of teaching in a rural, cross-cultural setting. What many students were less prepared for however, were the kinds of demands they would face in their final, or what is frequently referred to as "the professional," year of their teacher education program.

The UAF Teacher Education Program

All teacher education students were required to complete a minimum of 130 credits of university level coursework to graduate (an almost impossible task to complete in eight semesters because students were not allowed to enroll in more than 24 credits during their last two semesters). All were required to apply for formal admission to the Teacher Education Program after completing at least some of their required education classes and prior to beginning their final year. Admission to the program was determined by a committee of education faculty members based on a review of applicants' grades, essays, and letters of recommendation.

The teacher education program at UAF is approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and is similar in most ways to teacher education programs across the United States. During the time when this group of students attended UAF, they were required to complete coursework in three primary areas:

1. General university requirements, which included approximately 60 credits in both lower and upper-division courses in English, math, science, social sciences and humanities (most classes were three credits);

2. A concentration requirement (similar to a minor) in which students were required to take 12 upper-division credits in one academic area (e.g. humanities/language arts, math/science, or social sciences);

3. Education courses which consisted of 33 credits from 11 education foundation courses (e.g. introduction to education, children's literature, diagnosis and evaluation of learning, communication in cross-cultural classrooms); and 24 credits during the final year with 12 credits of integrated "methods" classes in the first semester, and 12 credits of student teaching in the last semester.

In the methods courses (referred to as the "methods block"), students spent about half their time in a classroom working with an individual teacher. They spent the other half on campus in university coursework where they examined various methods for teaching and evaluating learning in the areas of language arts, math, science, and social studies. Following completion of the methods semester, students completed their student teaching, by working under the guidance of a cooperating teacher in a classroom for an entire semester. All students were required to complete the methods block in Fairbanks, and following that they were free to choose to do their student teaching in Fairbanks or in another part of the state. Twenty-three students chose to go to a rural area, 2 chose to go to another urban area, and the remainder (25) chose to do their student teaching in Fairbanks.

In addition to having a program structure and curriculum design similar to that of many other teacher preparation programs in the United States, UAF faces many of the same challenges of other programs—the prime one being that of finding a reasonable balance between the time students spend in public school classrooms (i.e. practice) versus time spent in university classrooms (i.e. theory). Although a great deal of rhetoric has been generated about the value of providing opportunities for students to connect theory with practice early in their educational careers by working in actual classroom settings, such opportunities continue to be quite limited. Reasons for not placing students in classrooms earlier are usually attributed to the complexities of working out collaborative arrangements with school districts, but they can also be attributed to the fact that education faculty members (particularly those in research universities) quickly learn that there are few rewards within the university system for time spent working with students or with classroom teachers in out-of-university settings.

Prior to their final year at UAF, most students had only minimal opportunities to observe or participate in Fairbanks classrooms. Some students in this group did have the opportunity to get into the local schools early because they were enrolled in an "Introduction to Education" course during an experimental period when all of the students (approximately 110 each semester) were placed in Fairbanks schools for a practicum/fieldwork assignment for three hours per week throughout the entire semester. However, after this early practicum experience there were few other opportunities for education students to get into school classrooms until their final year. Each student did spend a total of 10 hours helping with special education classes or with special education events as part of an "Exceptional Learners" course, and students in the elementary program spent a total of three additional hours in a school library as part of the requirement for their "Children's Literature" course. Students who took the "Communication in Cross-Cultural Classrooms" course completed 30 hours of fieldwork per semester in out-of-school settings with community groups such as the Literacy Council, adult education classes for ESL students, and adult programs at the local correctional center.

By the time university students in most fields of study reach their final year of coursework they have at least some sense of beginning expertise in their chosen field of study. Not only do they have some mastery of the subject matter they are studying, they also have developed the self-confidence and skills necessary to successfully negotiate their way through the academic and non-academic demands of the university community—i.e., they have figured out the rules for surviving within a university system. Students in the field of education, however, frequently have a different type of experience in their final year because they are introduced to, and expected to learn in a very abbreviated period of time, an unwritten set of rules for survival in a very different institution—public schools.

Urban Schools

Several students in this study reported that the biggest challenge they faced in college was completion of their final year, and nearly all reported that the methods semester—the first semester when they were in the Fairbanks schools—was the most stressful semester of their university career. Some students indicated that the self-confidence that they had built up during their previous years at UAF was nearly depleted during the experiences of their final year.

Although the Education Department at UAF does not have official data about the number of teacher education students who encounter problems in their final year, it is evident that the experiences during the last two semesters tend to create a great deal of stress for many Native students. In this study group alone over 30 percent of the students encountered difficulties in the school settings that were resolved only when arrangements were made for them to extend the time period of their methods or student teaching practicum. They either had to repeat the entire methods semester, or to change schools or cooperating teachers in the middle of the semester.

Although students indicated that a variety of factors caused stressful situations to develop, their reflections and explanations about the difficulties they encountered in their final year fell into two primary categories: problems that developed because of their unfamiliarity with large urban schools, and problems caused by differences in interaction styles between several Alaska Native students and some participants in the public school settings. Students also cited problems that developed because of their lack of preparation for student teaching in small, rural, multi-graded schools (when their placements were in these types of schools), or challenges encountered because they were "the Native" student teacher.

Eighty percent of students in this study completed most or all of their twelve years of public schooling in small, rural, multi-graded schools where class enrollments are frequently less than 15. Students who lived in small rural areas knew everyone in their school personally, usually referred to teachers by their first names, felt comfortable wearing kuspuks (traditional Eskimo dress) and mukluks to school, and in Yup'ik areas students often used their Native language to converse with one another and with the classroom aides. The schools in Fairbanks, however, where students were required to complete all of their methods practicum in the first semester of their final year, are quite different. The average elementary school has over 600 students; there are three or four classes at each grade level with an average enrollment of 25 in each; the faculty often number over 40 per school; there are no teacher aides in regular classrooms; second languages are heard infrequently; teachers are seldom referred to by their first name; and it is not unusual for people in the same building not to know one another. Only 20 percent of the students in this study had attended schools similar to those in Fairbanks.

- I remember how strange it felt when I first went into a school here in Fairbanks. I had never been in an elementary school before where the students didn't speak Yup'ik.
- It [the methods semester] was the first time I had worked with students who spoke only English and I found that I wasn't comfortable . . . at home I use both languages. I start out with English and then when I need to explain I translate it into Yup'ik.
- They should have let us know what to expect—we haven't been in any of these kinds of classrooms or schools before—and it's definitely not the same as those we're accustomed to.
- We needed to get into the schools in Fairbanks to see what they are like.
- The closest I ever came to quitting school was when I had to go into the Fairbanks schools to observe for the first time—that was really hard for me. I had never been in a Fairbanks school before, and I had no one to go with . . . and I knew that there were four times more students in that school than in my whole village.
- If teachers had just treated us the same way they tell us to treat minority students that we'll have in our own classrooms someday, than our times in the schools would have been a lot better—I guess I'm surprised they didn't practice what they preached.

Teacher education students at UAF, like elsewhere, who previously have attended large urban public schools are fairly well prepared for their last year of practicum work because they have an insider's knowledge and understanding of the particular culture of this type of classroom setting, even if they have not studied it formally or spent time in schools since they were students. Their own schooling experiences provide them with a default mode that they can readily and intuitively draw upon when difficulties arise. Students who have not received their formal education in this type of environment have a great deal more to figure out than their urban counterparts. Of course, the reverse is true also, and the same kinds of challenges arise for non-Native urban students who attempt to complete their professional year requirements in small, rural, cross-cultural classrooms if they have no previous familiarity with that context.

Differences in Interaction Styles

Students described a variety of challenges they faced in their final year, but a review of these difficulties indicated that students frequently focused on and recalled situations that involved some kind of miscommunication. These usually developed because the verbal and non-verbal interaction patterns used by many of the students were not typical of those used by many of the participants in the classrooms. Problems usually developed due to actual miscommunications among students and their cooperating teachers and supervising teachers, and/or students' use of some styles of teaching that were not characteristic of those used by the majority of teachers in public schools.

Although students had previously experienced a variety of personal and academic problems at UAF because of interaction differences, the consequences of these differences were often more serious in the busy, intense and crowded public school classroom settings than they had been in the university classroom settings. Most of the university classes that students had already completed had not been structured to allow for interaction among participants, and in the smaller number of classes where this had been an integral component, students had not usually been evaluated on, and penalized only infrequently for, their use of different oral communication styles.

Students reported that, in the public school settings, they were often criticized for not talking enough, for not requiring the students to talk more, and for not talking loudly enough. Their use of, and comfort with, long pause times and silence in general in the classroom was often not shared by the teachers with whom they were working. In addition to these more obvious types of differences, students also described several instances where they felt they were misunderstood because of subtle differences between their own and their cooperating teachers' and supervising teachers' ways of conveying verbal and non-verbal messages. In addition, students who had spent a lot of time working in small, rural classes where each room had a classroom bilingual aide were accustomed to—and more comfortable with—

working with children on an individual and small group basis, rather than with a group of 25 or more students at one time, many of whom they did not know personally.

Students' reflections on some of the interaction patterns they brought to the classroom settings provide some insight into how and why misunderstandings developed.

- It's just so hard for us to come out of a village and to try and change the ways we've grown up with. I just always felt different and I thought that everyone else knew what they were doing, but then I found out later that they really didn't. One of the best things that I learned was that just because non-Natives talk louder doesn't mean that they are smarter.

- I think one of the things that was difficult for me was to show that I understood something. I was always excited about having learned something, but some of us Natives are stoic . . . and I think that even when we do learn something we don't display it like non-Natives do.

- Some non-Native teachers and faculty just talked and talked all of the time . . . they didn't ever give us a chance.

- When I grew up I learned by listening, not by talking.

- I am a typical Athabaskan, as I do not talk too much, but I am not afraid to ask questions.

- My host teacher was really outgoing and talkative and I am just the opposite . . . I felt so inferior to her.

Students provided examples of the areas in which they had been told they needed to improve, and they recalled the kinds of advice they had been offered.

- I could be a really good teacher [because I know my subject matter well] if only I could learn to present the material the way they want me to in front of big classes.

- My ability to present ideas orally in front of a large group had to be worked on because of what other people considered shyness . . . that though had to do with my cultural background.

- My cooperating teachers gave me tips to improve my teaching—for example they worked with me on voice modulation . . . and although I agreed that I needed to improve in this area I also knew that it was a cultural difference, and it was something that I did not need to be able to do to be a good teacher at home. When I taught in the school at home, kids *never* had any trouble hearing me.

- My professor told me that I should go to a hockey game and practice shouting so that I could learn to talk louder in the classroom.

- When I talked as loud as they wanted me to it sounded to me like I was shouting.

- My host teacher was very direct and very hard but she was good—she told me my problems were due to my Village English and she was always correcting me. She told me that it would be the biggest stumbling block toward getting a job in Fairbanks. Sometimes I'd get very discouraged about it.

Students' comments made it evident that they were not adverse to learning to use what Cazden (1988) refers to as "teacher talk," as long as they were not expected to embrace it as inherently better. Those students who had acquired the ability to consciously use an appropriate classroom dialect felt empowered with their ability to "turn it on and off" at will.

- I always knew that I could switch it on and off. The real me is more traditional in interaction style, but I could switch on to a more sophisticated style when I needed to. This worked and I enjoyed doing it as well. But, I know a lot of Native students who had not learned how to do that, and I would see them in the classrooms and I really did see teachers treating them differently because they were not sophisticated. They weren't suave, they didn't use big words, they didn't even dress the way you're supposed to dress to be successful.

The expectations of teachers for a particular kind of interaction style that many UAF students simply did not have caused some of the most stressful situations that students experienced at UAF. In most instances, however, students did not realize, or did not identify at the time, the complexity of the causes for the difficulties they were having. They often blamed themselves and began to doubt their ability to teach. Many reported that they found it difficult to experience the excitement of finally being in, or of being back in, a classroom with children because they were spending so much time just trying to figure out what was culturally appropriate and acceptable on a day-to-day basis.

Comments from the students suggest that UAF could strengthen its teacher preparation program by providing earlier opportunities in which faculty, teachers and students could interact with one another to identify similarities and differences and explore options for working through the inevitable miscommunications that occur when people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds attempt to work closely together in classroom settings. Opportunities for early immersion experiences in a context that allowed for honest and in-depth examinations of cross-cultural interactional differences would benefit rural Alaska Native students who work in urban schools; non-Native students who choose to work in rural schools serving Alaska Natives; and teachers and faculty who work with both groups of students.

Student Teaching in Rural Schools

All of the students in this study had similar public school experiences during the first semester of their final year because they all completed their methods block in Fairbanks. Their student teaching experiences were different, however, because approximately half of the group spent their final semester in rural schools, in their home region, completing their student teaching.

Since 1980, all teacher education students on the Fairbanks campus have had the option of completing their student teaching in a rural school. The proportion of all UAF teacher education students choosing this option has ranged between 25 and 50 percent, with many non-Native students taking advantage of the opportunity to get rural teaching exposure because they hope to be hired in a rural area. Twenty-three students in this group chose to student teach in a rural area for a variety of reasons. Some students simply did not want to live in an urban area.

- I wanted to learn to teach in a place where I wanted to live. I think I always knew that I was a village or a rural person. I don't mind not having running water and I'd rather put up with some of those inconveniences than live in an urban area.
- I hated living in Fairbanks a lot of the time. I often felt claustrophobic because of all the trees . . . we don't have trees at home.
- After living in urban areas, I decided that concrete and streets aren't for me.
- I get restless in the city . . . I'm just not a city person . . . I wanted to student teach where I wanted to live.
- Although I have spent a large portion of my life outside of my village, I can't get used to living in a city. I like the quiet, personal atmosphere, and the sense of a close-knit community of living in a village.

Others talked about wanting the opportunity to practice teaching in the type of school where they hoped to get a job, and they wanted to make connections with people in the district where they hoped to be hired. Some students stated that transportation and childcare would be more manageable if they did their student teaching in their home region where family support was available.

- I was really worried about transportation if I stayed in Fairbanks to do my student teaching. I knew that some of the other Native students had to take the bus at 6:45 every morning, and they couldn't even get breakfast on campus before they had to leave for school.
- I couldn't figure out how I would pay for babysitting if I stayed in Fairbanks for student teaching.
- I need to teach in a rural area for at least five years so that I don't have to pay back my Alaska Teacher Scholarship loan. So I did my student teaching in a rural school because that's where I needed, and wanted, to get a job.
- I wanted to get experience in multi-graded, small schools and I wanted to work with the people who I hoped would hire me.

The problems cited most frequently by students who did their student teaching in rural settings developed because the university education classes and the methods block courses were primarily oriented toward urban schools and did not often consider the special conditions of small rural schools. Although students' previous schooling experiences in rural villages was an asset, it was not always sufficient to help them accomplish what was expected of them as a teacher in a rural area.

- I did my student teaching in a rural area because I wanted to teach in a rural area, but I found it was really hard [since I had only been prepared for an urban school . . .]. I didn't have experience doing preps for, and actually teaching in, several different subjects like teachers in small high schools do. I wish I'd had the opportunity to practice in a small high school before I had to actually do my student teaching there.
- I thought my host teacher [in Fairbanks] was a wonderful person and I learned lots of tricks from him that would be helpful for someone who wanted to teach in a huge school, but it didn't prepare me at all for the type of small rural school where I did my student teaching and where I'll be teaching after that.
- I hadn't had any experience working in a classroom where there were students from three different grades all together in one room when I started my student teaching.

While students who did their student teaching in rural areas did experience miscommunication problems with host teachers, their bigger concern clearly was feeling unprepared for dealing with multi-graded classes, classroom aides, bilingual programs, and the demands that come with being responsible for teaching in several different subject areas.

Student Teaching in Urban Schools

Students who chose to student teach in Fairbanks did so for a variety of reasons: Fairbanks was their permanent home; they had entered into a marriage or personal relationship with someone whose home was Fairbanks; they wanted the experience of student teaching in a larger, urban school district; they wanted to increase their opportunities for getting hired in Fairbanks; or they wanted to return to one of the rural school districts that favored candidates who had student taught in an urban school.

The most common problems for students who student taught in the Fairbanks schools related to the two areas discussed previously: problems with learning (at least fast enough) all of the unwritten rules for appropriate behavior in urban schools, and problems that developed because of interaction differences. Most of the students who completed their student teaching in urban areas with good experiences (or at least without serious problems) were those who had previously spent a lot of time in urban schools in the role of student, parent or school employee. They had been around urban schools long enough to understand the school culture, and they had become facile and sophisticated in their use of standard urban school communication styles.

The last condition that was mentioned by some students (more so in urban than rural areas) as a contributing factor to the challenges they faced in the classrooms was their discovery that they were identified as "the Native" student teacher.

- My host teacher was very pleased to find out that I was a minority. [The student adds the following comment so that I will remember it when I transcribe the audiotape]—I'm rolling my eyes! . . . She asked me if it felt neat to be so special and she asked me what I told people when I met them . . . she was very sincere, *but* . . . .

- My host teacher was telling other teachers that she was so proud of herself because she had helped *a Native* become a teacher.

It is important to note that nearly all the students who were interviewed talked about many people in the cooperating schools who were caring, supportive and well-intentioned. Furthermore, there have been some changes made in the education program since the group of students in this program completed their work. However, the majority of Fairbanks teachers continue to have few opportunities to work closely with adults from Alaska Native backgrounds, and the majority of teacher education students continue to have few opportunities to work with non-Native teachers in the context of a large urban school prior to their final year. The lack of opportunities for teacher education students and school and university personnel to gain accurate information on one another's cultural and linguistic patterns and expectations is a problem area that has not yet been adequately addressed.

Students' Recommendations

When I asked students for their recommendations about ways to provide opportunities for future Alaska Native teacher education students to have more successful experiences during their final year in the teacher education program, their advice fell into the following categories: provide urban *and* rural classroom opportunities, deal early and openly with differences in interaction styles, encourage faculty and teachers to have experience in cross-cultural settings and to use multiple methods for teaching and evaluating, and develop survival strategies.

- Make sure students get to spend lots of time in the Fairbanks schools before they have to do their methods.
- I would recommend that everybody get some experience in rural schools. I loved going to Minto, [a small school that some of the secondary students visit] but it was only for one week!
- Try not to send Native students to schools in Fairbanks where there are no Native students and no Native teachers . . . I still wonder why I was sent to a school like that.
- I wonder about the wisdom of putting some of us in situations where we spend so much time learning how to memorize the names of, and then learn techniques for, managing 135 students a day. I will never put that into use. It was just not a real experience for me but I had to adopt it and assimilate to the Fairbanks teachers' styles. Even though I got good marks and enjoyed the classes at the school where I was, nothing in that situation was real for me. There were eight students in the classroom where I did my student teaching . . . what I wanted, and expected to learn at UAF was something about teaching in *small* schools too.

Students also had specific recommendations for faculty and for classroom teachers—several addressing communication differences.

- It may be that faculty and classroom teachers need cross-cultural experiences themselves before they can work with students like us who are different.

- I wish my university professors had been more honest with us . . . they've practiced too long being polite. When we got up in front of them and our fellow college students in our university classes [to give presentations or to practice our lessons on them] we didn't really know if we'd gotten our point across or not. We didn't get honest and accurate feedback on how our lesson was going to be received in a real public school classroom setting here in Fairbanks. . . . They [faculty] always just had their polite faces on—no matter what we did.

- Native students will have a good student teaching experience if their cooperating teacher has worked with lots of other Native students before—it worked for me.

- One of the most important things for non-Native faculty and teachers is to know about different communication styles of Natives—especially rural Natives.

- They should require everyone to take more cross-cultural communication courses—I learned some valuable things about non-verbal communication [in an upper division speech communications course] that helped me to understand myself better.

- Teachers should try out different ways of teaching in the university classrooms. They should use some of the ideas that we talk about in our education classes.

- I think that putting the methods students and student teachers in places where they can be of some real service, and can really be helpful to the school would be good. I think teachers would appreciate that . . . they would really, really like that. But then again, I think that should probably be done prior to methods. . . . I think students should be put in positions where they're really appreciated first, and then when they go back for methods, the acculturation would already have taken place. So then students wouldn't have to experience that during methods or student teaching. The university wants so much to keep cooperating teachers happy—it's like the student is almost at the mercy of the cooperating teacher. They define exactly what you do. And the university seems to be so grateful to have you out there somewhere, anywhere, that they sometimes don't even give students the benefit of the doubt.

Students also had other kinds of "survival" advice.

- Try to stay connected with some friends during methods and student teaching. Most of us really lose our Native support system on campus during this time because we can't spend much time at RSS, we're hardly in the dorms, and we're not in classes with any other students during student teaching. It's really quite a lonely experience.

- When I was just taking classes at the university I could almost balance both—although I did have to give up part of myself in order to find that balance. [When I was doing methods and student teaching it was a lot harder] to continue to be true to both sides, and jumping in on either side didn't allow me to be myself.

- How do you survive institutions? I told my students when I was student teaching that school is an institution . . . it's like a hospital. You survive here, and you can go anywhere—and that's what I kept telling myself too.

- Don't be afraid to tell someone if your methods or student teaching experience doesn't feel good. Let someone else know so they can do the talking for you. I thought my first [bad] experience was my fault but it wasn't . . . they finally figured it out and put me in a place where I felt like a human being again.

Students' reflections on the kinds of difficulties they encountered during their experiences in public school classrooms—especially the Fairbanks school system—suggest that UAF and other teacher training institutions will need to increase their efforts to prepare graduates who have accurate information about *other* people, and who have a sincere and honest interest in teaching and learning from people who come from a wide range of cultural, ethnic, geographic, linguistic and religious backgrounds. The importance of preparing graduates who are sensitive to, and respectful of, an increasingly diverse student population is accentuated by the fact that we live in a country in which one-third of the children in public schools will be minority children by the year 2000. Since public schools are the only institution in the United States that involve and directly impact such a large number of people, they are the logical place to implement programs that at least attempt to provide equitable opportunities and outcomes for people from all backgrounds. Teacher education programs in universities should be leading advocates for reform in this area, and faculty should be collaborating closely with people in public schools to foster the development of a school system and a larger society that will allow for greater tolerance for diversity, and a genuine respect for cultural minority students *and* cultural minority teachers.

Employment and Future Plans

If we use, as a measure of student success, whether or not graduates are able to get (and keep) jobs in the field for which they have been prepared, the 50 students in this study were highly successful. The first year after their graduation, 27 graduates were employed in rural areas; 17 in urban areas; three were full-time graduate students; one was employed in a non-education position; and two were not employed.

In the rural areas, 25 students were classroom teachers, 1 worked in a central office administrative position and 1 was in a counselor/teacher position. Seventeen were in urban areas—14 in Fairbanks and 3 in Southeast Alaska. Of those who remained in Fairbanks, 6 were classroom teachers, 2 were substitute teachers and 5 were employed with Alaska Native education programs. Three students worked in urban or small towns in the Southeast area of

Alaska, 2 as classroom teachers and 1 as a substitute. Three were full-time graduate students, 2 in Alaska and 1 outside the state. One student worked in a professional, but non-educational position in a Native corporation, and 2 were not employed.

There was little change in this employment picture in the fall of 1994. One additional student was employed in a rural area (for a total of 28), and one less in an urban area (15). Two other students lived in an urban area and worked for federal or Alaska Native corporation educational-related programs. Two graduate students were in schools outside of Alaska and one remained in the state. One student was employed in a private, non-educational, business in a rural area, and 2 students in rural areas were not employed.

Students' decisions about where to locate and which job opportunities to pursue were based on where family, new spouses or possible future partners were located (in addition to financial considerations that related to student loan repayments or student loan forgiveness). As indicated by several of the students' previous comments, there was little ambiguity about where they wanted to teach, and for most, that was where they went. Others, however, changed some of their plans while they were at UAF because of marriage, or the strong possibility of marriage.

Some of the rural female students in this group mentioned that one of the concerns of their parents (in regard to attending UAF) was the possibility that their daughters might meet and marry someone who was not from a rural area and who was not Native, and thus they might not return to their region or remain in Alaska. Based on the experiences of students in this group, this concern was not unfounded. Of the 37 women in the group 29 were, or had previously been, married when they graduated from UAF. A total of 19 women were, or had been, married to—or had a long-term relationship with—a non-Native man. Nine female students had met their spouse or partner while they were in Fairbanks attending UAF, while the other 10 were married to, and some divorced from, non-Native men before they came to UAF. Most of the women who met their husbands in Fairbanks married fellow UAF students or military men who were stationed in the Fairbanks area.

Ten women were married to, or had a long term relationship with, an Alaska Native man—6 met their spouse or partner after they began their studies at UAF. Most of the female students from rural areas who met their non-Native husbands in their home community returned to that community or region to live and to teach. A smaller number of the women who met their non-Native husbands while they were on campus at UAF had returned to their regions to teach, and others said that they were not yet certain whether they would permanently return to their home area because their husbands were not familiar enough with rural communities to feel that they could make a long term commitment.

Out of the 13 men in the group, eight were married or were involved in a long-term relationship, and 7 of the 8 took jobs in rural areas after graduation. Six were married to, or had a partner who was, an Alaska Native woman. Three couples met while attending UAF, and 3 met previously. Two men married non-Native women while at UAF. Five of the male students were not married, and all 5 chose to live in an urban area after graduation.

When asked specifically about their future plans, the majority of the students said that they intended to go on in school and receive administrative credentials and graduate degrees. Many had quite specific ideas about the kinds of changes they would like to implement if they were a principal or a superintendent in a rural school district. Several students said that they were very interested in traveling throughout the United States and in other countries of the world, but almost without exception they indicated that Alaska was where they wanted to live on a permanent basis.

Keys to Success

At the end of each interview, I asked students if they would think about what it was that "kept them going" during the times when they felt discouraged, and what they might tell other students who would ask them about their "key to success." They seldom hesitated when they responded to this question, and in general their comments reaffirmed the themes that had surfaced repeatedly throughout the interviews. Students said that it had been essential for them to have both family members *and* someone on campus who they knew believed in their ability to succeed, who cared about them as an individual, and who accepted and respected what they brought to the university environment (i.e. their cultural and linguistic heritage and perspective). They needed people to connect with who did not expect them to change who they were in order to succeed.

In almost all circumstances, students talked about the pivotal role that their families had played in providing continual emotional support. Students were motivated to be successful because they did not want to let their families and communities down. They worked hard to meet the expectations people had for them.

- I was very close to my parents, and because they had high expectations for me, I had high expectations for myself.
- I always had family members who cared about how I did.
- I had a lot of support from my husband and from other family members. I always knew that they wanted me to succeed and I didn't want to let them down.
- I had family members who believed in me. They would tell me "I don't know how you do it, but I'm so proud of you." It always made me feel real good, and all the bad feelings I had about studying and school would go away and turn into determination.
- I didn't want to let my family and my community down. I broke the ice [by going to college] and now more have followed.
- My parents, my grandparents and my community *expected* me to succeed.
- I had always told people at home that I was going to go to college. . . . And when I was growing up my parents had always told me that if you tell someone you're going to do something than you have to do it or else people won't trust you anymore . . . so, I had to go to college and I had to finish!
- People [in my village] expected a lot of me because I had done well in our high school. I felt that I was expected to finish college.
- I didn't want to go back home without succeeding, not just because I didn't want to let people down and I didn't want to let them think I was a loser.
- I wanted so badly to be the first one in my family to graduate. I even dreamt about it at lot, and my parents always supported me.

Just as frequently as students cited their families and communities as pivotal to their success, they also described the importance of having individuals or groups on campus that provided similar kinds of support and motivation.

- I knew what I needed when I returned to UAF for the second time, and so I went straight to RSS. I relied on the strong support network in RSS.

- Being a part of the RSS and RAHI network was very important [to my being able to succeed].

- After I got connected with RSS and RAHI people there was no doubt in my mind that I could make it. I just knew I could do it, and it felt good . . . It made me feel comfortable after I knew there were people that would be there to help me.

- RSS was most helpful and I cannot stress this enough. The advisors were the greatest and the students there were able to develop a bond with each other because we were all working toward the same goal of receiving a degree . . . They (the staff and the students) would let us know that they believed in us and they knew we could succeed.

- I had a strong support network of friends on campus that came from RSS and RAHI.

- I would not be where I am now if it hadn't been for the constant support that my RSS advisor gave me . . . sure she made me made feel mad, sad, and stupid sometimes—but she was always there.

Students remembered how important it was to have instructors who cared and courses that were relevant and interesting.

- Another factor [in succeeding] was UAF itself. I think the small campus with everything right there helped. I was able to find some instructors that really did care about students and were more than willing to help.

- I really needed to have at least one course each semester that was interesting and that was related to the real world.

- I had a few instructors who not only knew their areas, but who truly took the time and opportunity to know me as an individual student. I needed them to let me know that I was more than just a number.

Others described the motivation that came from having set clear goals for themselves—goals sometimes determined by early family and community experiences and sometimes defined or refined by experiences they had while they were away from UAF.

- When I came back to school the second time I had clear goals . . . and I was not afraid.

- When I came back to school [after taking a long break] I was stronger, and even though I still hated some aspects of school, I had a clear goal in mind and I was just able to do it and get it over with.

- My goal was to make a better life for myself. I grew up in a really bad situation and I wanted to prove to myself and to everyone at home that I would not be like so many others that had quit and gone home in a year. I was just not going to be a dropout because I always had a vision of what my life could be like . . . and education was my only way to accomplish this.

- I did not want to be like so many other young girls at home who get pregnant and live with their parents and don't have money or interesting jobs.
- I really wanted a degree to make sure that I had lots of options in my life.
- I was older when I started school and my goal was just to learn . . . I knew that I couldn't be a good teacher unless I learned a lot.
- I always took things one step at a time. I would get through whatever I needed to and then move on to the next goal. If I didn't do it this way it was just too discouraging. I knew what I wanted.
- I had a goal [to get my degree and become a teacher] and I was determined to accomplish it.
- My own determination to get my degree was one of the main factors [in my success].
- The best thing I had [that kept me going] was my sense of humor. If I hadn't had that I would have left UAF many times. I had a lot of support and was around other people who had a positive outlook toward me. I also had to learn to accept bad grades . . . when I got my first bad grades I was heartbroken and mostly ashamed, but I tried not to feel like a total loser. Learning to pick myself up from this was the greatest ability I think I had. . . . My goal all along was to be an excellent teacher and that's what kept me going.

Comments

Several factors can be identified as contributing to the success of the 50 students in this group. Their individual strengths and personal characteristics were clearly an important variable, and many of the strengths that were most critical to their success were the qualities that are often described as being integral to the culture of most Alaska Native people. Students in this group were guided and motivated by a strong appreciation and respect for family and community values and mores; they had a sense of responsibility for one another that led to collaborative efforts to work with and support one another; many felt a deep sense of pride in their Alaska Native culture and language and they affiliated and gained strength from people and programs that respected and nourished this pride; and they relied upon a wholistic and integrated approach to solving their personal and academic problems.

A commonly-made statement by students from minority groups is that they feel they have to work twice as hard a people from majority groups in order to be successful in many academic environments. I think the data make clear that Alaska Native students in this group did have to work harder than most non-Native students to receive their degree and teacher certification. In addition to mastering the academic coursework, they were required to learn and then follow the unwritten rules for successfully negotiating the culture of universities and public schools, all the while attempting to maintain the dignity and integrity of the culture they brought to the UAF environment.

In the final chapter I examine some of the implications for policy and practice that emerge from an integration of the information in Chapters 4 through 7: the past and present schooling practices of Alaska Native students, the changing context and climate of UAF, and the stories and experiences of these 50 Alaska Native teacher education graduates.

CHAPTER 8

LEARNING ABOUT LIFE ON THE OTHER SIDE: RECOMMENDATIONS

At the beginning of Chapter 1, John Active describes going to college for Alaska Native students as experiencing "life on the other side." The young Yup'ik woman he refers to had to "become another person, an opposite of herself" to survive college. Implicit in his observation is that students bear all of the responsibility for adaptation if they are to succeed when they enter a university.

My initial response to Active's comments was that he had succinctly captured the challenge Alaska Native students face in their efforts to become graduates of the University of Alaska Fairbanks. When I began to address more systematically my research question, *What factors contributed to the academic success of 50 Alaska Native teacher education students at UAF*? Active's observations seemed to point to where I might look for some explanations. I began to examine the question of whether students' academic success was dependent on their willingness to fundamentally change who they were and "buy into" the norms of university life.

As a result of my research I found that there were multiple factors that contributed to the academic success of the students in this study, and the "chameleon" factor identified by Active was indeed an issue that students did encounter in many aspects of their university experiences. However, I also discovered that there were a variety of approaches available to institutions for assisting students in learning about and, when appropriate, utilizing university ways of talking, writing, interacting and displaying knowledge. Those that were most effective in helping students understand university cultural norms were those that encouraged students to build upon and integrate their own cultural background and ways of knowing along with those espoused by the institution. The programs, services, courses, and people at UAF that were most instrumental in helping students to succeed academically did not demand that students give up who they were and become an "opposite of themselves" in order to succeed. They were instead, those that had an awareness of, and a genuine respect for, *life on the students' side*.

The data indicate that the students in this group were successful because of accommodations made by both the students *and* by the institution. Although neither always made these adaptations voluntarily, and although responsibility for change was not distributed equitably, it is evident that there was a sense of shared responsibility for learning about and respecting the history, culture, traditions and belief systems of the other. As each side learned more about life on the "other" side, each benefited.

Factors that Helped Students to be Academically Successful

In this section I summarize the factors students identified as being most important to their academic success. I have organized them under five major headings and have provided several specific examples of each. In the next section, I draw upon these factors to make recommendations for steps that institutions, faculty, students and community groups can take to facilitate success for cultural minority students in general, based on the experiences of this group of Alaska Native students.

Academic success for Alaska Native students on the Fairbanks campus of UAF was facilitated by the factors listed below. All attest to the necessity of adaptation by *both* students and the institution.

1. A teaching and learning environment responsive to the interests and needs of culturally diverse students

   As characterized by

   - Opportunities for students to interact with faculty in and out of classroom settings
   - Opportunities for students to interact with other students in classroom settings
   - Opportunities for students to enroll in coursework and to complete assignments directly related to the responsibilities they will have in the professions for which they are being prepared
   - Opportunities for students to take courses and complete assignments that will assist them in solving existing problems in their own community, region and state
   - Availability of course materials that are accurate, current and relevant

- Availability of context-specific courses that students can use to fulfill university core requirements and specific degree requirements

- Availability of faculty and staff who know, or make an effort to learn about, the students, the community and the issues specific to their particular institution and region

- Availability of faculty who have high expectations for all students, offer multiple avenues for support, and evaluate students' learning and competencies in multiple ways

- Availability of faculty who make an effort to know students as individuals

2. Student support services respectful of the interests and needs of culturally diverse students

   As characterized by

   - Availability of advisors who can offer advice and recommendations for course selection, cohort scheduling, tutoring options, personal counseling and financial aid on the basis of: accurate knowledge about individual students; and broader contextual knowledge about students' communities, high schools, and funding organizations.

   - Opportunities for students to participate in formal and informal academic-related activities that allow them to learn in environments where they can build upon their previous experiences and their cultural heritage (e.g. elders potlucks, special theater, dance and art groups, local and national student associations)

   - Opportunities for students to work for the university in jobs related to their major field of study or with programs that serve students with similar experiences or interests (e.g. in academic departments, high school bridging programs, recruitment programs, academic clubs, resident hall programs)

   - Provision of a designated central place on campus large enough for groups of students from cultural minority groups to gather to accommodate the following: student meetings, guest speakers, study and tutorial sessions, potluck dinners with students' families, semester "kick-off" events, offices for advisors and counselors, computer lab, kitchen facilities, and nearby offices for related programs

   - Availability of programs, courses and personnel that help students learn about and understand the university system (e.g. "University Significant Others," high school bridging programs, preparatory courses, orientation programs, orientation classes).

3. Strong family and community support

   As characterized by

   - Family and community members who provide opportunities for students to communicate with them frequently by phone or by mail

- Family and community members who help students maintain a balance and keep priorities and values in perspective through their frequent expressions of encouragement and their high expectations
- Family and community members who send "care packages" with special foods, and news or videos about family and community events and happenings
- Family and community members who provide additional financial support when possible
- Family and community involvement in local schools (in the role of parent, school board member, school district employee, etc.)

4. Supportive prior school and life experiences

As characterized by

- Availability of elementary and high school teachers who are demanding, but caring, individuals with high expectations
- Availability of elementary and high school teachers who require that students do a substantial amount of reading and writing in their classes
- Opportunities for students to attend high schools in settings where other students and faculty give evidence that they care whether or not the student succeeds
- Opportunities for students to participate in a variety of high school events and activities that provide options for leadership and travel
- Opportunity for students to have direct experiences with schools as bilingual or classroom aides, as substitutes, as parents, or as school board members
- Opportunities for students to have jobs that provide a better understanding of, and ability to work within, a large bureaucratic system
- Opportunities for students to have experiences in a wide variety of multicultural situations that provide them with an ability to better understand and utilize the multicultural environment of a university

5. Exceptional individual efforts

As characterized by

- Students' persistence in returning to college after long periods of absence or after prior negative experiences
- Students' initiative in seeking out faculty members in out-of-class situations
- Students' efforts to find on-campus and summer jobs related to education
- Students' ability to work cooperatively and learn from, and with, fellow students

- Students' creative efforts to balance family, community and school responsibilities
- Students' willingness to remain positive despite major setbacks
- Students' ability to defend their people and their culture in public, and in sometimes unwelcoming, situations
- Students' tenacity in not deviating from pursuing their goals of becoming a college graduate and a teacher
- Students' courage in being the first member of their family or community to attend college

In the next section, I integrate information from Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 with the factors just listed, to develop a set of recommendations for improving the academic success of minority students on university campuses.

Institutional Recommendations

The efforts of these 50 students to succeed in college, and the efforts made on the Fairbanks campus of UAF to respond to issues of diversity, provide lessons that can guide us in determining future policy and practice. In this section, I outline some recommendations that evolve directly from the identification of "factors that helped students to be academically successful." Although all of the recommendations are closely related and dependent upon one another, I present them in four categories—determined by where the primary level of responsibility for implementation is: (1) institution, (2) faculty, (3) student, and (4) community.

This first set of recommendations requires support, implementation and monitoring by personnel who work at the institutional level (including president, chancellor, provost, deans, directors, department heads, faculty senate and appointed or elected governing boards).

Recommendation 1

Institutions should adopt a comprehensive plan that is used to guide decisions regarding minority student programs and services

In the period of time when the 50 students in this study attended UAF, there was little effort to develop and use any type of *comprehensive* plan that could serve as a basis for policy, program and financial decisions regarding Alaska Native students, though there were a myriad of statements and proposals prepared by individual units in the system. The information included in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 highlights some of the consequences that occur when policy and program decisions are not guided by a well-developed set of plans. UAF's efforts to be both an internationally respected research university *and* a comprehensive public service institution responsible for meeting the needs of all the people of Alaska contributed to confusion and to the sending of confusing messages to the general public and to members of its own campus community about its purpose, priorities and primary values. Its attempt to be all things to all people often contributed to the development of unrealistic expectations by students (and their parents), and by incoming faculty and administrators.

Many colleges and universities in the United States today have not yet developed comprehensive plans that are appropriate for, and responsive to, a more heterogeneous student population. In the absence of such a plan, institutions have the option of responding ambiguously and inconsistently to efforts to provide campus environments that support the full participation of cultural minority students. Without guidance and direction from a well-defined and agreed-upon set of policies, participation from members of university communities will continue to be uneven, with some individuals and units assuming little or no responsibility for contributing. If programs for minority students are not an integral component of a long-term institutional plan, they become vulnerable to the priorities of each new administration and consequently are subject to marginalization and a disproportionate share of reorganizations.

Although the students in this study were not able to benefit from such a comprehensive plan, one has since been developed that clearly and directly addresses Alaska Native students and issues. In May of 1993, UAF adopted a comprehensive policy statement, Strategic Plan: UAF 2000. It was prepared during the previous year, at the request of the Chancellor, by a broadly representative committee of 21 people. The plan was presented to the UAF Board of Regents in February, 1993 with the Chancellor's commitment that "budget decisions in the future will FOLLOW the strategic plan." The recommendations of the fourteen-page plan are organized into six categories.

By the year 2000 UAF should:

- Become the world's leader in Arctic research and graduate education
- Provide high quality undergraduate education for traditional and non-traditional students
- Be a leading partner with communities, industry, and government to solve specific state and national needs
- Become the educational center for Alaska Natives
- Be a model that demonstrates how gender, racial, and cultural diversity strengthen a university and society
- Be the academic gateway to the Russian Far East, the North Pacific, and the Circumpolar North

Included in the narrative of the fourth goal is the statement "UAF must work even more closely with Alaska Native communities and organizations to create better opportunities in higher education for Native students. Native people must have full participation in the educational process . . . (and) one of the specific goals is to retain and graduate significant numbers of Alaska Natives" (Strategic Plan, 1993, p. 9). Alaska Native people, and others, are now turning to this plan to formulate a more coherent rationale for the programs and services offered by UAF for Alaska Native students.

As recent reviews of institutional responses to diversity confirm, policy does not always guarantee practice. Although it remains to be seen whether long-term plans, such as that developed at UAF, will have a significant impact, they clearly have the potential to alleviate some of the problems that have been encountered by cultural minority students and by those who seek to initiate new programs and services or modify existing ones. *If* comprehensive plans are indeed used by institutions as a litmus test to determine funding and program priorities, they can provide support and stability for an integrated system of programs that respond to the interests and needs of minority students. If institutions choose to not develop—or not use—comprehensive plans, it will be clear evidence that they have chosen to operate with the kind of equivocation and lack of coordination that is reflected in the policies and practices at many colleges and institutions in the United States today. Comprehensive planning documents that address minority student programs and services provide a basis for monitoring and accountability, and they are clearly essential to the development and maintenance of responsive campus communities.

Recommendation 2

Institutions should support campus subcommunities

On nearly every campus today there is debate about the appropriateness of providing university support for certain types of student groups or "subcommunities." At UAF, like elsewhere, there are a variety of student subcommunities in which affiliation, or in some cases, membership is determined on the basis of variables such as gender, age, religion, country of origin, race, ethnicity, culture, family status, academic concerns, athletics, talents, or other similar interests. Common to all of these groups is that participation is voluntary—students are not required to join or affiliate.

In some university settings the existence of some of these groups is considered a threat to the health of the larger community. When Irving Spitzberg and Virginia Thorndike (1992) explored the options for Creating Community on College Campuses, they encountered "some concern, mainly from administrators, about the potential negative effects of subgroups and 'little loyalties.' The most frequent concern was expressed about Greek social organizations and groups of students from the same racial or ethnic background. "Were they not choosing to separate themselves too much from other students, and shouldn't one worry about the dynamics of like choosing like?" (p. 150).

When students register to take courses at any college or university, they technically become members of the campus-wide community, but the level of their involvement and participation varies greatly. Part-time students and those who live off-campus often choose to affiliate instead with subcommunities in the wider vicinity that are not affiliated with the institution. Full-time students, and especially those who live on campus however, participate more actively in the life of the campus community, and many choose to affiliate with one or several campus subcommunities.

Nearly all of the 50 students in this study did *choose* to affiliate with the Alaska Native subcommunity on the UAF campus, but with varying levels of participation. Some chose to involve themselves by formally joining an Alaska Native club, project, program or study session. Others chose to associate in a less formal manner—usually by using the Rural Student Services (RSS) space (lounge, advisors' offices and computer work station) as a place to meet and study with friends and advisors, attend potlucks, hear guest speakers, get news of campus events, and "listen in" on student meetings that occurred in the lounge area.

Based on the comments of Alaska Native students at UAF, and on studies of cultural minority students in other institutions, having a physical place on campus where students can feel at ease with themselves and where they can connect with others who have common interests and experiences is a critical factor in student success. Although the physical facilities provided for minority student groups on most campuses are usually small and limited (the University of British Columbia being a noteworthy exception with its First Nations Longhouse), they still provide the opportunity for students to interact and study in a culturally comfortable environment. They provide a place where students are allowed, and encouraged, to connect what often seems like disparate facets of their lives. This physical location is usually the only place on campus where minority students have the opportunity to visit with elders, be with children, eat traditional foods, and hear familiar languages or dialects—i.e. experience the sense of community that is not available to them because they are away from their home communities. Students at UAF described the Rural Student Services area as a place where they could learn *and* at the same time feel comfortable and proud about being an Alaska Native. The programs, and "the place," provided by Rural Student Services played a paramount role in most students' ability to succeed academically, and for many it was necessary for their survival.

Since so many students in this study indicated that participation in the Alaska Native subcommunity was important to their academic success, what is an appropriate response to the concerns of those who worry that participation in subcommunities (especially on the basis of race, ethnicity or culture) will lead to separation and divisiveness? It seems apparent that such fears are justified *only* if a college or university system does not support a reason for, and an environment in which, subcommunities can meaningfully connect with one another and with the larger community. In the discussion of multiculturalism in Chapter 5, I indicated that the concept of "pluralism" appeared to be close to the vision that many people have of a truly multicultural society. Pluralism, it was noted, provides a climate in which people from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds are allowed and encouraged to retain characteristics of their particular groups (e.g. maintain their own languages, social networks, residential enclaves, churches), *while at the same time sharing some aspects of a common culture and participating individually and collectively in the larger society's economic and political life* (Cashmore, 1984).

As in many higher education institutions, shaping, developing and sharing a common culture was not the same kind of challenge at UAF in 1969 (when the student population was nearly homogeneous) as it is in 1994 with over 20 percent of the student population now coming from cultural minority backgrounds. Today UAF is encountering many of the same types of identity problems as are other institutions that have a comprehensive and/or research mission. In contrast, higher education institutions in other categories (e.g. small liberal colleges, church-affiliated colleges, technology institutes, research universities with a high percentage of graduate students, historically Black colleges, tribal colleges)—despite gaining a larger and more diverse student population—frequently have not suffered these kinds of identity crises
because they have continued to develop and strengthen their campus cultures around previously identified, and agreed-upon, common goals and purposes. UAF, though, and many other universities are finding it increasingly difficult to arrive at consensus about their

raison d'être. This institutional ambiguity contributes to the mixed messages that subcommunities and individuals receive as they attempt to find meaningful ways to *weave together* their interests in an effort to create and maintain a common campus culture.

Institutions, like UAF, that attract diverse groups of students with a wide range of real-world experience and expertise have unlimited opportunities to develop structures and programs in which individuals and small groups can pool their resources and work collaboratively toward common goals (such as improving the quality of life around them). University *classrooms* are microcosms that have the potential to serve as places where students from a wide variety of subcommunities can interact and examine issues of concern to the community as a whole. In residence halls and student housing compounds as well, there are ready-made opportunities for bringing students and other members of the campus community together in natural ways to solve real problems. However, traditional approaches to designing programs, teaching and delivering courses, and devising institutional policies frequently do not provide an opportunity for students to be genuinely involved in developing an integrated campus community in which members can contribute to solving authentic campus and community problems. To develop integrated campus-wide communities, it is essential that institutions provide strong support to assure the existence of vibrant and healthy subcommunities.

Recommendation 3

Institutions should support faculty development and recruitment around issues of diversity

To be certified as a public school teacher in the state of Alaska, candidates must complete a three credit course that addresses "multicultural education" and another that addresses "Alaska Studies." The rationale for this requirement is that all teachers need an understanding of the context in which they are working to be an effective teacher. To be hired as a faculty member at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, candidates need no experience or previous coursework in teaching (as is true in nearly every higher education institution), nor are they required to have any knowledge of the regional or state context.

Students in this study reported many instances where misunderstandings and miscommunications occurred because faculty members were working with misinformation (or preconceived stereotypical notions) about Alaska Native and/or rural issues. They also reported many instances when they were penalized for their unfamiliarity with the protocols of university life (i.e. their preconceived stereotypical notions), despite the fact that nearly all were first generation college students and many had no previous experiences with any type of higher education institution.

As reported in the Change survey cited in Chapter 5, 42 percent of higher education institutions have faculty development programs that are specifically targeted at multiculturalism. Support for faculty is provided through a combination of campus workshops, incentives for course development, study leaves and research. Since many administrators, faculty and student service personnel in the field of higher education today are working in cultural contexts quite different from those that defined Western higher education for so many years, there is an urgent need for collaboration within, and across, university campuses. Cultural diversity in campus communities is still a relatively recent phenomena. Since there are few role models for faculty or institutions to turn to, all colleges and universities have an opportunity to serve as pioneers in higher education efforts to generate new systems and structures that will allow for broad participation from a cross-section of the population.

Recommendation 4

Institutions should revise the faculty reward system to foster faculty-student interaction

The climate of a campus is clearly impacted by the policies that are used to implement hiring, promotion and tenure practices for faculty. At UAF, as at all research-oriented universities, the reward system is based primarily on faculty members' research and publication efforts. As the studies described in Chapter 5 indicate, undergraduate students who seek their degrees in a research university frequently do not have the opportunity to benefit from significant faculty contact.

There was a strong and unambiguous message from students in this study that supportive faculty contact—in and out the classroom—was a critical factor in their ability to learn and to succeed academically. Students stated unequivocally that having interested and interesting teachers was pivotal, and they recalled specifically the courses in which they had the opportunity to work with faculty who met these criteria. However, the reality of academic life at research institutions is that the type of faculty interaction described by students (e.g. opportunities to interact through office visits, advising sessions, participation in student academic organizations related to their disciplines) does not lead to faculty rewards or advancement.

The challenge for research-oriented universities is to demonstrate that not only can they be successful in the area of research, but that they can be equally successful in developing initiatives that will allow them to become leaders in providing innovative and high quality teaching and learning opportunities for undergraduate student populations that include people from diverse cultural backgrounds. To do this, colleges and universities will need to provide appropriate incentives in their criteria for faculty hiring and advancement, as well as to develop a more equitable reward system for the cadre of student services personnel and part-time, non-tenured, temporary faculty whose work is so crucial to the academic success of minority students in most institutions today.

Recommendation 5

Institutions should attend carefully and comprehensively to non-academic needs

It is evident based on the review of the experiences of the 50 students in this study that all participants in the campus community (including faculty) need to be more attuned to the impact of non-academic factors on students' ability to succeed academically. As students clearly indicated, it is difficult to focus on studies when they find themselves challenged by an institutional environment that requires constant attention to problems related to housing, personal safety, dependable child care, finances or reliable transportation.

In all university settings (and in particular on larger campuses), a coordinated effort among different institutional units (e.g. academic, student services, financial aid) could lead to the development of policies that would be more responsive to the needs of all non-traditional students. For example, academic departments should schedule required off-campus courses at times when public transportation is available; library hours should be expanded to meet the needs of a wider range of students; more family housing should be available; and colleges and institutions must take a strong proactive and preventive approach to providing a safe campus environment for all students.

These non-academic factors affect the academic performance of all students, but such institutional policies have the greatest repercussions on those students for whom the campus is their primary community. It is evident that UAF's policies have a major impact on many Alaska Native students because such a high percentage rely upon and utilize campus facilities almost exclusively when attending the university.

It is easy for faculty and administrators who are not directly involved with student services to forget about, or overlook, these kinds of non-academic issues because of the assumption that such concerns have been delegated to others. However, when the barriers that are interfering with students' ability to study and learn are institutional in nature, then all members of the campus community should assume some responsibility for addressing them.

Recommendation 6

Institutions should foster constructive dialogue between minority and non-minority students and faculty

The number of non-Native UAF graduates that have chosen to remain in the state has increased steadily over the past 20 years. Many have become leaders in the political, social and economic life of Alaska. The prediction is that more will continue to seek employment in the state. Despite this, many students graduate from UAF with only minimal knowledge of the state, and many leave UAF with the same incorrect information about Alaska Native people and issues they brought with them when they entered. Universities need to assume more responsibility for the preparation of graduates who will be more comprehensively prepared to serve in roles as future legislators, members of the business community, state employees, engineers, teachers, etc. All university graduates should be able to draw upon and utilize their university experiences to assist them in becoming informed, knowledgeable, concerned and contributing citizens of the state and members of the national and international community.

Universities can take advantage of their diverse student populations by requiring that *all students* participate in courses in which they *collectively* study and grapple with current and anticipated concerns related to issues of diversity. By providing students who have grown up in vastly different circumstances with accurate information about one another, and with a context in which to interact, universities can help to: dispel misperceptions, contribute to the development of campuses where there is more cross-cultural interaction, and prepare students for the reality of living in a state, nation and world in which they will be required to make complex personal and professional choices about issues relating to diversity. Higher education institutions need to assume the responsibility and challenge of living and working in a multicultural community, and a student's degree should enhance his or her ability to contribute meaningfully to this community.

Recommendation 7

Institutions should provide support for alternative delivery systems for academic programs

Sixty-five percent of the students in this study completed at least part of their required coursework in a rural area. Some were students in the off-campus teacher education program (X-CED) before moving to the Fairbanks campus, some took courses through a rural campus during semesters when family circumstances required them to be home, and many chose to do their student teaching in a rural school setting. Students said that the off-campus, distance education opportunities to pursue their degrees were important factors in their academic success because they allowed them to begin, or to continue, their coursework with direct support from family and community. The off-campus settings provided students with the opportunity to learn in, about, and from the unique educational environment in which they wanted to teach.

Over the past 25 years the University of Alaska has piloted and implemented a wide range of distance education services as part of its mandate to provide higher education for "place-bound" students. The use of audio, computer, and video conferencing for course and program delivery, and the presence of faculty members at rural sites, has allowed students in even the most geographically remote areas of the state to complete coursework and satisfy degree requirements. While UAF's pioneering distance education efforts have been designed primarily for students who have not been able to come to a central campus location, it is evident from this study that they have also provided an important option for those students who did choose to complete the majority of their coursework on the Fairbanks campus.

With the technological support available today, all colleges and universities have multiple opportunities for decentralizing their services by providing innovative and, at the same time, high quality and challenging programs and courses to students who are not able to utilize the services of a central campus. Many of these are non-traditional and/or cultural minority students. Institutions should continue to explore multiple avenues of providing instruction so that increasing numbers of such students can access university programs.

Faculty Recommendations

Although many institutional-level policies and practices contribute to increased academic success for Alaska Native students, there are several that can be accomplished through the efforts of individual faculty and students. In this section, I focus on those that can be initiated by faculty members.

Recommendation 1

Faculty should become informed about students in their institution

As described previously, students in this study talked about the importance of working with faculty who were at least minimally knowledgeable about Alaska Native and rural issues.

Under ideal conditions, faculty efforts would be supported by the institution, but lack of support at this level does not excuse faculty from a professional obligation to acquire accurate information through their own initiative.

Books, articles, newspapers, films and videos about current issues in a community, region or state are usually readily available. Numerous lectures, seminars and other community-wide events are often sponsored by both university-affiliated groups and by other local groups such as social groups, business organizations, church groups, etc. In any university setting, there are unlimited opportunities for sitting in on, or auditing, one or more of the courses that are specific to the people and culture of the area. Perhaps the most under-utilized resources, however, are minority students themselves. Faculty efforts to meet, talk with, and get to know students on an individual basis provide a rich opportunity to acquire first-hand information about people and issues in the context in which one is teaching.

Recommendation 2

Faculty should utilize multiple teaching and evaluation processes

The second recommendation for changes that can be implemented by individual faculty members responds directly to the concerns expressed by students about teaching and evaluation processes. There was a great deal of consensus among students about the importance of "good" teaching and opportunities for interaction with faculty as being important factors in their academic success. As described previously, students said they learned more when they had teachers who took the time to get to know them as individuals and who at least attempted to make classes stimulating, engaging and relevant.

At UAF, and at most other colleges and universities according to the national Change survey summarized in Chapter 5, the primary means that institutions have used to respond to increasingly diverse student populations have been to either add student support services, or make changes in the curriculum. Curriculum, however, is only one instructional facet of an institution. Equally important are teaching and evaluation practices, and yet only minimal changes have been made in higher education in these areas during the past 50 years. The information provided by students in this study indicates that practices in these two areas are critical to the academic success of minority students.

Individual faculty members who are interested in modifying their teaching and evaluation techniques can get ideas about "what has worked" for others by soliciting ideas and feedback from students in their own classes, developing ongoing dialogues with colleagues in their own institutions and with faculty elsewhere, and reviewing research studies about teaching and evaluation practices in higher education and in elementary and secondary schools. Although this would appear to require a significant expenditure of time and effort, one quickly discovers that there is a great deal of agreement about what it takes to improve teaching and evaluation practices.

The reform efforts in the nation's elementary and secondary schools have been prompted by many of the same concerns that are now leading to the call for similar reform efforts in higher education. Concerns at *all* levels of the educational system include low standards, low achievement levels, high drop-out rates, and increasing levels of public dissatisfaction. The efforts and recommendations of those involved in public school reform are surprisingly similar to those now emerging in higher education. This clear and obvious alignment suggests that higher education is doing itself a disservice by not utilizing the expertise of educators and researchers who work with the public school system. It seems quite appropriate that faculty members involved in teacher education could, and should, contribute more to the improvement-of-teaching discussion in higher education by serving as liaisons between those who teach elementary and secondary students and those who teach university students.

It is apparent that what the Alaska Native students in this study identified as being important for their academic success is exactly what many of the knowledgeable and experienced educators and researchers are recommending for *all* students at every stage of their educational experience. This includes having teachers who: have high expectations for *all* students, evaluate using multiple criteria, provide opportunities for students to interact with one another and the instructor, require current and varied readings, and attempt to make course content relevant. However, it also appears as though the consequences of not having access to teachers who use a variety of teaching and evaluative techniques are different for some groups of students. Those who are first generation college students, speakers of English-as-a-second language and/or those who have never attended sizable institutions often pay a heavier penalty than other students when they are enrolled in traditional large lecture classes.

Although many faculty in universities are anxious and willing to experiment and take risks in an effort to improve their teaching and evaluation techniques, their enthusiasm often wanes when they discover that, in universities with a research emphasis, they receive only minimal support and their efforts are not rewarded in the same way as research and publication. There are, of course, other explanations for faculty members' reluctance to make changes in teaching and evaluation methods (e.g. they are philosophically opposed or lack interest). However, one of the least discussed, but perhaps most insidious, reasons may be that faculty do not wish to become involved in the perceived conflict between maintaining quality and responding to diversity. Faculty are frequently uncertain about how to defend non-traditional teaching and evaluation practices as being as rigorous and demanding as traditional methods and standards. This tension occurs most often in research universities where the de facto rules for evaluating students are frequently the same as those used for evaluating faculty. Theory is given priority over practice; individual efforts are encouraged and rewarded more than group efforts (e.g. single authored journal articles or papers are valued more highly than co-authored ones); written contributions are valued more highly than oral ones; distance between those of unequal status is maintained (e.g. tenure-track/non-tenure track, senior/junior faculty, student/faculty) and competition is integral to the system. In the face of collegial skepticism, faculty are often reluctant to depart from traditional scripts.

It is evident that academic success for many minority students depends on the availability of teachers who give teaching a high priority in their professional lives. However, as mentioned earlier, such faculty commitment *must* be accompanied by an institutional response that gives value to the effort by rewarding it in ways that count in hiring, tenure and promotion decisions.

Student Recommendations

To be academically successful, students in this group had to (1) be highly motivated and work very hard, (2) take the initiative to learn about and use a wide variety of campus resources, and (3) draw upon their families and communities to gain support, direction, balance and strength.

Recommendation 1

Students should strive to maintain a positive and persevering outlook

The Mission Statement of Rural Student Services includes a sentence that identifies one of the most important factors that contributed to the academic success of the 50 Alaska Native students in this study.

> The commitment of Rural Student Services is to respond to student needs by providing quality services to Native and rural students who expend positive energy in the pursuit of higher education and its opportunities.

Students in this study did expend a great deal of positive energy as they pursued their university degree and worked toward their professional goals. Their efforts were characterized by a "move forward" attitude and their persistence—in spite of setbacks that often dishearten university students—was impressive. Their tenacity and resilience was evident in their patterns of returning to school even after long periods of absence or after negative and potentially defeating prior college experiences. They were simply not willing to give up on pursuing the goals they had identified as being important.

Many of the students learned that it was necessary to work very hard to be academically successful and they felt that their efforts and achievements were often reviewed more critically *because* they were minority students. Most of them demonstrated remarkable creativity and resourcefulness in finding ways to integrate and balance their multiple sets of school, home and community responsibilities—and many students drew upon humor as a resource to help pull them through confusing and frustrating situations. The experiences of these 50 students make it apparent that they could not have been successful without drawing upon and expending a great deal of "positive energy."

To the extent minority students face the extra demands of having to merge two lifeways to be successful in either, qualities such as determination, perseverance, resilience and a positive outlook can be key factors in offsetting the institutional odds weighted against them. These are qualities over which students themselves exercise a degree of control, so they can be drawn upon as a powerful tool to overcome institutional barriers that might otherwise cause them to give up.

Recommendation 2

Students should seek out and utilize a wide variety of campus resources

In addition to drawing upon all of their internal resources, students also took the initiative to learn about and use a wide variety of campus resources. Nearly every student used and contributed to at least one of the campus subcommunities as a means of learning how to be a successful UAF student and as a means of networking with other students. Some students relied only upon the residence hall or family housing subcommunity to provide this, but the large majority of students in this study used the broader UAF Alaska Native subcommunity as the primary group to learn from and with.

With Rural Student Services as a conduit, students learned about and utilized a wide range of university support services. They signed up for classes as a cohort, joined study sessions, met with instructors out of class, sought tutoring when necessary, joined academic clubs, applied for scholarships, attended special seminars, got counseling when needed, volunteered to assist in university events, and enrolled in orientation activities and courses. They sought jobs in campus positions that contributed positively to both their personal and professional lives.

It is evident that students discovered that "academic hard work" was only one of the components necessary for success. They also needed, and clearly benefited from, the university resources that helped them to achieve academically by encouraging them to utilize and build upon their cultural backgrounds. Their experiences are evidence of the direct benefits that can from the additional support provided through culturally sensitive targeted programs and services. Hard work *and* extra programs are necessary ingredients for success. Minority students should seek out those programs and services that respectfully address their interests and needs and help them to achieve their personal and professional goals.

Recommendation 3

Students should maintain close connections with family and community

Based on interviews it is evident that students' strong and deep relationships with immediate families, extended families and communities were responsible for shaping much of what they did at UAF, why they did it, and how they did it. Their approach to problems, their efforts to work collaboratively, their ability to see "the big picture," and their strong understanding of and belief in the essence and strength of "community" were factors that helped them to balance the demands, expectations and belief systems of what many of them perceived as two different worlds.

Those students who maintained close connections with family and community members via the phone, mail system, and when possible through home visits said that this communication was essential to helping them maintain a larger perspective on why they were at UAF. Others indicated that the continued connections helped them in their efforts to develop and maintain the necessary "academic and personal balance" that the Rural Student Services mission statement describes.

Without exception, all of the students interviewed said that their families and/or communities had played an important role in their ability to be academically successful. Many were motivated by their family's and community's visions and hopes that, as first-generation university graduates, they would be able to influence positively the direction of their home communities and the future of the next generation. These expectations were a powerful factor in many students' decisions to continue their schooling. Although physical and cultural distance can pose a challenge, students should seek to maintain close ties with their families and home communities while attending college.

Community Recommendations

Minority community organizations and representatives should maintain a strong advocacy and support role on behalf of minority students. As the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 makes evident, numerous Native community groups played an important role in students' ability to succeed at UAF. These groups included local and regional organizations such as advisory and regional school boards, school districts, village and regional profit-making and non-profit making Alaska Native corporations. They also included statewide organizations including the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN), rural Alaska legislators (i.e. the Bush Caucus), and informally affiliated Alaska Native alumni of the University of Alaska.

Some of these groups had official responsibilities for, or direct input into, the development of institutional policies as members of the College of Rural Alaska Advisory Council or as state legislators. Many organizations, though, contributed in a less direct manner through the use of formal or informal advocacy, lobbying and monitoring of university policies and practices. Nearly all groups made financial contributions to individual students, and many also contributed to one or several Alaska Native programs and services at UAF. Students believed that support from village, regional and state groups was important to their academic success, and based on their interview statements, it is evident that there were significant village and regional differences in the level of support provided.

Students who benefited the most from community groups were those who came from regions where the school district and Native corporations worked together to establish and maintain a wide range of policies and practices to support "their" students during the time they attended UAF. Examples of the kind of support students most frequently commented on included: direct financial assistance in the form of scholarships, provision of a special residence facility on the Fairbanks campus, school board member visits to campus once or twice a year to meet with students and university officials, availability of a school district and community person hired specifically to serve as a liaison between UAF students and their communities, publication of a regional newsletter that included information about area students who were attending other post secondary institutions, and financial support that allowed students to attend state and national conferences.

Minority students' ability to survive the academic rigors of college, and at the same time, stay connected to and involved with their communities and their cultures is greatly facilitated by the level of direct and indirect support they receive from their home community and political advocates. Minority communities must continue to demonstrate their interest in and support for minority college students and advocate on their behalf in all educational, political and economic arenas available to them.

Implications for Further Research

The Centre for Maori Studies and Research at the University of Waikato in New Zealand includes in its mission statement the position that there be "no research without development and no development without research" (Harrison, 1993). As an outcome of this research project, I have identified five areas for further research and development that need to be addressed if we are to improve the undergraduate experience for ethnic and cultural minority students.

1. The higher education experiences of minority students should be examined from a more comprehensive, holistic and context-sensitive perspective that is responsive to, and respectful of, differences among institutions and among various groups of students.

The standard assessment procedures by which most programs and services for minority students are currently evaluated are based largely on quantitative data, and on the assumption that programs function independently of one another. There is a need for more research that examines the synergistic influences among programs within institutions, and a need to provide support for studies that take into account the cultural contexts of minority students who come from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

If we are to gain a better understanding of the factors that determine success in university settings, it is necessary that we learn more about the experiences of students in high schools. In Alaska, many of the demands on high schools and post-secondary institutions are unique and complex, and it is essential to understand more about the relationship—or lack of such—between the two types of institutions. Collaborative projects in which high school teachers, university faculty, and community members work together would provide important information about the correlation between students' high school experiences and their success in higher education. This type of research could also lead directly to the development of more coordinated services between the two institutions.

2. There is a need for research that is designed to provide opportunities for students and faculty to "think globally and act locally."

State universities need to provide greater support for research about real problems and research that can contribute to the development of solutions that are responsive to the particular state and regional context. In Alaska, collaborative efforts to solve the critical problems associated with high teacher turnover in rural schools, high drop-out rates among Alaska Native students in urban high schools, and the increasing suicide rate among young Alaska Native males are examples of the kinds of genuine problems that university research needs to address.

It is important also to continue to learn from the experiences and expertise of people in similar situations in other states and countries. Since the educational histories and traditions of indigenous peoples in other countries of the world have such strong parallels with those of Alaska Native people, we should continue to explore options for collaborative and comparative research.

3. There is little information available on how faculty can adapt curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation practices to respond to and be more respectful of, the range of cultural predispositions students bring to the educational setting.

Until recently there have been only minimal efforts to examine or improve teaching in higher education. Such research would benefit from collaborative work between people involved in public school reform and those involved in higher education reform who are attempting to develop new approaches that will benefit all undergraduate students. Identifying appropriate kinds of teaching and evaluation techniques for higher education will also require meaningful student involvement in the research process.

4. There is a need for more research that helps us understand better how we can more appropriately organize our institutions to respond to a multicultural student population.

Relatively little research documents the college experiences of non-traditional students, and most institutional decisions continue to be based on research that is not representative of the current student population. Such research is especially important in those institutions that serve a high proportion of minority students. Future research needs to address the question of "how do students affect colleges?"

We need to know more about the contributions of alternative higher education structures such as Black Colleges, Tribal Colleges, open-learning and distance education systems, and affiliated programs.

5. There is a need for more understanding about the relationship between teacher education students' academic success in a university and their opportunities for personal and professional success beyond the university.

Very little research speaks to the personal and professional consequences of minority students' undergraduate experiences. We know little about students' ability to return to and "fit in" their home community if they so choose. We have little data on whether or not minority teachers modify their curriculum, pedagogy or evaluation techniques, and if so, why and how? We know little about the consequences of being a minority teacher in a majority school. These questions lend themselves to collaborative projects that utilize the expertise of the community and the resources of the university and at the same time contribute to the development of ongoing support systems by and for minority teachers.

Comments

It is commonly accepted that a university experience is one in which students will undergo change, or as the statement on the front of a brochure distributed by one university guarantees, "You'll go home a different person." The essential question is: will students be different because they have been able to build upon the identity they brought to the university setting, or will be they different because they had to "become an opposite of who they were in order to survive college."

It will be several years before the graduates in this particular group will understand all of the personal and professional consequences of their academic success at UAF. Hopefully, they will be able to return to their families and communities as "different people" because their university experiences have allowed them to *add* to—and not replace—the unique cultural identities they brought to the university setting. We must hope that the university too has experienced a change and has become a different place—a place respectful of, and responsive to, the interests and needs of students who come from different cultural backgrounds.

The common thread that has woven its way through all phases of this research is that little or no meaningful change for minority students in higher education can occur unless people on both sides assume a personal and professional responsibility to learn about "life on the other side." Since there are still few role models to learn from, each and every college and university must assume responsibility for developing campuses where cultural minority students can be fully represented, respected, involved and successful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Active, J. (1992, September 27). Two worlds can learn from each other. Fairbanks Daily News Miner, p. H-7.

Adams, D. (1988). Fundamental considerations: The deep meaning of Native American schooling, 1880-1900. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 1-27.

Adams, F. (1980). Highlander folk school: Social movements and social change in the American south. In R. Paulston (Ed.), Other dreams, other schools: Folk colleges in social and ethnic movements (pp. 214-234). Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies.

Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1987). The past and the future of ethnography. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 16, 4-25.

Altbach, P. (1974). University reform: Comparative perspectives for the seventies. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Altbach, P. (1979). Comparative higher education: Research trends and bibliography . London: Mansell.

Altbach, P. (1982). Higher education in the third world: Themes and variations. Singapore: Maruzen Asia, Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development.

Altbach, P. (1989). Perspectives on comparative higher education: Essays on faculty, students and reform. Buffalo, NY: Comparative Education Center, State University of New York Press.

Altbach, P. (1992). Patterns in higher education development: Toward the year 2000. In R. Arnove, P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Ed.), Emergent issues in education: comparative perspectives (pp. 39-57). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Altbach, P., & Lomotey, K. (1991). The racial crisis in American higher education. Albany: State University of New York Press, 275.

Altman, R., & Synder, P. (1970). The minority student on the campus: Expectations and possibilities. Boulder, CO: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, UC Berkeley and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, CO, 219.

Anderson, G. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status and new directions. Review of Educational Research, 59, 249-270.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 161, 67-72.

Apple, M. (1988). Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education. New York: Routledge.

Astin, A. (1982). Minorities in American higher education: Recent trends, current prospects, and recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? Change, 25 (2), 44-49.

Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., & Hammersley, M. (1988). Qualitative research traditions: A British response to Jacob. Review of Educational Research, 58, 231-250.

Barnhardt, A. (1992). Encouraging culturally responsive teaching: Affecting the head and the heart. Unpublished senior thesis, Brown University, Providence, RI.

Barnhardt, C. (1981). Communication in cross-cultural classrooms. Fairbanks, AK: Department of Correspondence Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Barnhardt, C. (1982). Tuning-In: Athabaskan teachers and Athabaskan students. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-cultural Issues in Alaskan Education (pp. 144-165). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Barnhardt, C. (1985). Historical Status of elementary schools in rural Alaska communities, 1867-1980. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Barnhardt, R. (1977). Field-based education for Alaskan Native teachers. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-Cultural issues in Alaskan education. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Northern Educational Research, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Barnhardt, R. (1991). Higher education in the Fourth world. Tribal College, Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 3, 11-14.

Barnhardt, R. (1991). Two cultures, one school: St. Mary's, Alaska. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17 (2), 54-66.

Barnhardt, R. (in press). Domestication of the ivory tower: Institutional adaptation to cultural distance. Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education.

Beaty, J., & Chiste, K. B. (1986). University preparation for Native American students: Theory and application. Journal of American Indian Education, 26 (1), 6-13.

Benjamin, D., & Chambers, S. (1989, April-May). Native American persistence in higher education: toward a competency model. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Baltimore, Maryland.

Berkhofer, R., Jr. (1978). The White man's Indian. New York: Vintage Books.

Blankenship, C., & al, (1992). Embracing cultural diversity in colleges of education: Minority recruitment and retention project. Salt Lake City, UT: Far West Holmes Group.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bok, D. (1992). Reclaiming the public trust. Change, 24 (4), 13-19.

Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown, A. (1980). Adjustment programs for the American Indian college student. In American Indian issues in higher education (pp. 117-132). Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center.

Brown, F., & Stent, M. (1977). Minorities in U.S. institutions of higher education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Bunzel, J. (1992). Race relations on campus. Stanford, CA: Portable Stanford Book Series.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). Tribal colleges: Shaping the future of Native America. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1990). Campus life: In search of community. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cashmore, E. (1988). Dictionary of race and relations. London: Routledge.

Cass, M., & Cass-Liepmann, J. (1994). Cass and Birnbaum's comparative guide to American colleges. New York: Harper Perennial.

Cazden, C. (1988). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, C., John, V., & Hymes, D. (1972). Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Choulnard, C. (1994, February 8). Rural Student Services celebrates 25 years at UAF. UAF Sun Star, p. 3.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1990). The Almanac of Higher Education, 1990. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Clark, R. (1972). Higher education programs for American Indians. Journal of American Indian Education, 12 (1), 16-20.

Collier, Jr., J. (1973). Alaska Eskimo education. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Collier, Jr., J. (1988). Survival at Rough Rock: A historical overview of Rough Rock Demonstration School. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19, 253-269.

Collier, M. (1986). A film study of classrooms in Western Alaska. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life. (1988). One-Third of a nation: A report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and Education Commission of the States.

Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian (1967). The Indian, America's Unfinished Business. Compiled by Brophy, W. & S. Aberle. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Crum, S. (1989). The idea of an Indian college or university in twentieth century American before the formation of the Navajo Community College in 1968. Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 1, p. 20.

D'Souza, D. (1991). Illiberal education: the politics of race and sex on campus. New York: The Free Press.

Darnell, F. (1979). Education among the Native peoples of Alaska. Polar Record, 19, 431-446.

Dauenhauer, R. (1982). Conflicting visions in Alaskan education. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Davis, Judith. (1992). Factors contributing to post-secondary achievement of American Indians. Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 4 (11), 24-30.

Dehyle, D. (1989). Pushouts and pullouts: Navajo and Ute school leavers. Journal of Navajo Education, 6 (2), 36-51.

Deloria, Jr., V. (1991). Indian education in America: 8 essays by Vine Deloria, Jr. Boulder, CO: The American Indian Science & Engineering Society.

Delpit, L. (1986). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 379-385.

Dickerson, D. (1980). Orientation needs of newly hired teachers in rural Alaska. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Dubbs, P. (1982). Cultural definitions and educational programs. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-Cultural Issues in Alaskan Education (pp. 7-15). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Dubbs, P. (1992, February). Sustainable development and indigenous people: Authors and actors in rural Alaska. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Regional Science Association, South Lake Tahoe, NV.

Dubbs, P., & Whitney, D. (1980). Cultural contexts: Making anthropology personal. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Duchene, M. (1988). Giant law, giant education, and ant: A story about racism and Native Americans. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 354-362.

Dumont, R. (1972). Learning English and how to be silent: studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom (pp. 344-369). New York: Teachers College Press.

Eddy, E. (1969). Becoming a teacher: the passage to professional status. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edgerton, R. (1994, April). Faculty Priorities and Changing Times. Presentation at University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Seminar. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Education Commission of the States. (1990). New strategies for producing minority teachers: Plans & programs. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Eisner, E. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E., & Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Erickson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Participant structures in two communities. In G. Spinder (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Esmailka, W. (1994). Balancing the circle of life: Athabascan women at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Everhart, R. (1983). Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school. New York: Routledge and Kegal Paul.

Falk, D., & Aitken, L. (1984). Promoting retention among American Indian college students. Journal of American Indian Education, 23 (2), 24-31.

Fetterman, D. M. (1988). Qualitative approaches to evaluating education. Educational Researcher, 17 (8), 17-23.

Fine, M. (1985). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. Teachers College Record, 87, 393-409.

Fleming, G. S., Gill, G. & Swinton, D. (1978). The case for affirmative action for Blacks in higher education. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Howard University.

Forbes, J. (1985). Native American higher education: The struggle for the creation of D-Q university, 1960-1971. Davis, CA: D-Q University Press.

Freedman, S. (1990). Small victories: The real world of a teacher, her students, and their high school. New York: Harper Collins.

Fries, J. E. (1987). The American Indian in higher education 1975-76 to 1984-85. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education, Center for Education Statistics.

From the Chancellor. (1992, May 26). UAF Cornerstone: Faculty and Staff Newsletter. University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Fuchs, E., & Havighurst, R. (1972). To live on this earth: American Indian education. New York: Doubleday & Co.

Fuller, B. (1991). Growing-up modern: The western state builds third-world schools. New York: Routledge.

Futrell, M. H. (1989). The importance of minorities in education reform. In E. Middleton, E. Mason, H. Barnard & F. Bickel (Eds.), Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Building Collaborative Relationships for the Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students in Teacher Education (pp. 13-19). Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky.

Gaffney, M. (1977). Economic and educational development in rural Alaska: A human resources approach. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-Cultural Issues in Alaskan Education (pp. 29-50). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Northern Educational Research, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Gage, N. L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. Educational Researcher, 18 (7), 4-10.

Garcia, C., Eubank, R., & University Students. (1976). Indian college students' perspective of education. Journal of American Indian Education, 16 (2),18-22.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Geiger, R. (1986). To advance knowledge: The growth of American research universities, 1900-1940. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilmore, P., & Glatthorn, A.(Eds.). (1982). Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Gilmore, P. & D. Smith. (1989). Mario, Jess and Joe: Contextualizing dropping out. In H. Trueba & G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts?. New York: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). Critical theory and the politics of culture and voice: Rethinking the discourse of educational research. In R. Sherman, & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods. London: The Falmer Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, M. (1989). Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Greene, M. (1988). Qualitative research and the uses of literature. In R. Sherman, & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods. London: The Falmer Press.

Gumperz, J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1979, April). Beyond ethnography: some uses of sociolinguistics for understanding classroom environments. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Tavistock.

Hampton, E. (1989). Toward a redefinition of American Indian/Alaska Native education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Hampton, E. (1993, May/June). Presenter on International Panel. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Harrison, B. (1982). Yup'ik Eskimo women and postsecondary education. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-Cultural issues in Alaskan education (pp. 192-204). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Harrison, B. (1993). Community based vocational training in New Zealand: economic development or cultural imperialism. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Heggoy, A. (1984). Colonial education in Algeria: Assimilation and reaction. In P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), Education and the colonial experience (pp. 97-115). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Hirsch Jr., E. D. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Holland, D., & Eisenhart, M. (1991). Educated for romance: Women, achievement and college culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hornett, D. (1989). The role of faculty in cultural awareness and retention of American Indian college students. Journal of American Indian Education, 29 (1), 12-18.

Horton, M. (1990). The long haul: An autobiography, with Judith Kohl and Herbert Kohl. New York: Doubleday.

Hostetler, J., & Huntington, G. (1971). Children in Amish society: Socialization and community education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Howe, K. & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: Aprolegomenon. Educational Researcher, 19 (4), 2-9.

Jackson, P. W. (1990). The functions of educational research. Educational Researcher, 19 (7), 3-9.

Jacob, E. (1988). Clarifying qualitative research: A focus on traditions. Educational Researcher, 17 (1), 16-24.

Jacquot, L. (1974). Alaska Natives and Alaska higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

James, J. (Ed.). (1993). Recruiting people of color for teacher education. In Phi Delta Kappa Hot Topics Series. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation, Development, and Research, Phi Delta Kappa.

Jensen, K. (1984). Civilization and assimilation in the colonized schooling of Native Americans. In P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), Education and the colonial experience (pp. 155-179). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

John, V. (1972). Styles of learning—styles of teaching: Reflections on the education of Navajo children. In D. Hymes, Cazden, C., John, V. (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom (pp. 331-334). New York: Teachers College Press.

Jones-Sparck, L. (1992, February). Not in two worlds but one. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Bilingual/Multicultural Conference, Anchorage, AK.

Kasten, W. (1992). Bridging the horizon: American Indian beliefs and whole language learning. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 23, 108-119.

Kawagley, O. (1990). Yup'ik ways of knowing. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17(2), 5-18.

Kawagley, A. O. (1993). A Yupiaq world view: Implications for cultural, educational, and technological adaptation in a contemporary world. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Keizer, G. (1988). No place but here: A teacher's vocation in a rural community. New York: Viking.

Kerr, C. (1991). The great transformation in higher education. Albany: State University of New York.

Kidwell, C. (1991). The vanishing Native reappears in the college curriculum. Change, 23 (2), 19-23.

Kimball, R. (1990). Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education. New York: Harper & Row.

Kirkness, V. (1993). First Nations House of Learning. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Kirkness, V., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four R's— respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. Journal of American Indian Education, 30 (3), 1-15.

Kleinfeld, J., Gorsuch, L., & Kerr, J. (1988). Minorities in higher education: The changing North. University of Alaska: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Kleinfeld, J., & Kohout, K. (1974). Increasing the college success of Alaska Natives. Journal of American Indian Education, 14 (3), 27-31.

Knowles, T., Gill, J., Beauvais, A., & Medearis, C. (1992). Teacher education and the Rosebud tribal education code. Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 4 (11), 21-24.

Kohl, H. (1991). I won't learn from you!. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Krauss, M. (1980). Alaska Native languages: Past, present and future. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. Interchange, 17 (4), 63-84.

LeCompte, M., Millroy, W., & Preissle, J. (1992). Handbook of qualitative research in education. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

LeCompte, M., & Preissle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. (1992). The quiet revolution: Eleven facts about multiculturalism and the curriculum. Change, 24 (1), 25-29.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Lin, R. (1990). Perception of family background and personal characteristics among Indian college students. Journal of American Indian Education, 29 (3), 19-28.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. London: Sage.

Lindblom, C., & Cohen, D. (1979). Usable knowledge: Social science and social problem solving. New Haven: CT: Yale University Press.

Lipka, J. (1990). Integrating cultural form and content in one Yup'ik Eskimo classroom. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17 (2), 19-32.

Lipka, J. (1991). Toward a culturally based pedagogy: A case study of one Yup'ik Eskimo teacher. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22, 203-223.

Lipka, J. (1994). Language, power, and pedagogy: Whose school is it? Peabody Journal of Education, 69 (2), 71-93.

Locust, C. (1988). Wounding the spirit: Discrimination and traditional American Indian belief systems. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 315-330.

Lofstedt, J.-I. (1990). Critical notice: Qualitative research methods in education. Interchange, 21 (4), 73-79.

MacLeod, J. (1987). Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood. San Diego, CA: Westview.

Madsen, E. (1990). The symbolism associated with dominant society schools in Native American communities: An Alaskan example. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17 (2), 44-53.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1989). Designing Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Mayhew, L. (1969). Colleges today and tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mazrui, A. (1984). The African university as a multinational corporation: Problems of penetration and dependency. In P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), Education and the colonial experience (pp. 273-291). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

McLaren, P. (1989). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education. New York: Longman.

McLaughlin, D. (1989). The sociolinguistics of Navajo literacy. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 20, 275-290.

McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (1989). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mehan, H. (1984). Language and schooling. Sociology of Education, 57, 174-183.

Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive studies. Sociology of Education, 65, 1-21.

Messerschmidt, D. (1981). Anthropologists at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Metz, M. (1984). Guest editorial. Sociology of Education, 57, 199.

Mikaere, S. (1993). Te Rangakura: Community initiated Maori teacher training. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Mingle, J. (1987). Focus on minorities: Trends in higher education participation and success. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Moffatt, M. (1989). Coming of Age in New Jersey: College and American culture. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Napoleon, H. (1991). Yuyuraq: The way of the human being. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, College of Rural Alaska, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

National Task Force for Minority Achievement in Higher Education. (1990). Achieving campus diversity: Policies for change. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Nettles, M. (1991). Assessing progress in minority access and achievement in American higher education. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Nordlin, V. (1993, April). Learning vs. teaching in today's universities [Letter to the editor]. Christian Science Monitor (p. 20).

Ogbu, J. (1974). The next generation: An ethnography of education in an urban neighborhood. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. (1978). Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. (1983). Minority status and schooling in plural societies. Comparative Education Review, 27, 168-190.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 18, 312-334.

Ogbu, J. (1992). Adaptation to minority status and impact on school success. Theory Into Practice, 31 (4), 287-295.

Oliver, J. (1991). The relationship between the racial attitudes of white college freshmen and sophomores as influenced by exposure to multicultural education practices. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Olson, J., & Wilson, R. (1984). Native Americans in the 20th Century. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press.

Omari, I. M. (1991). Innovation and change in higher education in developing countries: Experiences from Tanzania. Comparative Education, 27, 181-206.

Osborne, B. (1989). Insiders and outsiders: Cultural membership and the micropolitics of education among the Zuni. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20, 196-215.

Otis, M. (1980). Native Americans in higher education: Rationale and retention. American Indian Issues in Higher Education (pp. 59-65). Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center.

Palmer, P. (1992). Divided no more: A movement approach to educational reform. Change, 24 (2), 10-17.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, W., & Edington, E. (1973). Factors related to the persistence of Indian students at college level. Journal of American Indian Education, 13 (3), 19-23.

Paulston, R. (1991, March). Ways of knowing in comparative education: From correspondence and interpretation to interaction. Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA.

Peshkin, A. (1978). Growing up American: Schooling and the survival of community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peshkin, A. (1982). The imperfect union: School consolidation and community conflict. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Philips, S. (1982). The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. New York: Longman.

Pottinger, R. (1989). Disjunction to higher education: American Indian students in the Southwest. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 20, 326-344.

Prucha, F. P. (1984). The great father, Volume II. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Reyner, J., Lee, H., & Gabbard, D. (1993). A specialized knowledge base for teaching American Indian and Alaska Native students. Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 4 (4), 26-32.

Richardson, R., Jr. (1989). Serving more diverse students: A contextual view. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Richardson, R., Jr. (1990). The state role in promoting equity. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Richardson, R., Jr., (1991). Promoting fair college outcomes: Learning from the experiences of the past decade. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Richardson, R. Jr., & Bender, L. (1987). Fostering minority access and achievement in higher education: The role of urban community colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richardson, R., Jr., Matthews, D., & Finney, J. (1992). Improving state and campus environments for quality and diversity: a self-assessment. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Richardson, R., Jr., & Skinner, E. F. (1990). Adapting to diversity: Organizational influences on student achievement. Journal of Higher Education, 61, 485-511.

Richardson, R., Jr., & Skinner, E. F. (1991). Achieving quality and diversity: Universities in a multicultural society. Washington, D.C.: ACE-Macmillan.

Rist, R. (1973). The urban school: Factory for failure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roman, L. & Apple, M. (1990). Is naturalism a move away from positivism? materialist and feminist approaches to subjectivity in ethnographic research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate (pp. 38-73). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rose, M. (1989). Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared. New York: The Free Press.

Royal, T. K. (1993). The establishment of an indigenous people's higher education tertiary institution through legislation and grass roots initiative. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Salisbury, L. (1967). College orientation program for Alaska Natives: COPAN-66, a final report. (Submitted to Mr. Warren Tiffany, Acting ARea Director of Schools, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau, AK). College, AK: University or Alaska.

Scollon, R. (1981). Human knowledge and the institution's knowledge: Communication patterns and retention in a public university. (Final Report to National Institute of Education). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1979). Linguistic convergence: An ethnography of speaking at Fort Chipewyan, Alberta. New York: Academic Press.

Sherman, R., & Webb, R. (1988). Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods. New York: The Falmer Press.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Sizer, T. (1990, April). Assessment: A cautionary meditation from the schools. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Sizer, T. (1992). Horace's School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Smith, D. (1989). The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy? (Report No. 5). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University: School of Education and Human Development.

Smith, P. (1990). Killing the spirit: Higher education in America. New York: Penguin Books.

Social Policy. (1991). Building movements, educating citizens: Myles Horton and the Highlander Folk School (21), (Special Issue).

Spindler, G. (1974). Education and cultural process: Toward an anthropology of education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Spindler, G. (1982). Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1971). Dreamers without power: The Menomini Indians. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1987). Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Spitzberg, Jr., I., & Thorndike, V. (1992). Creating community on college campuses. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Strategic Plan: UAF 2000. (1993). Prepared by Strategic Plan team and presented to the University of Alaska Board of Regents on February 26, 1973. University of Alaska Fairbanks

Sykes, C. (1988). Profscam: professors and the demise of higher education. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Szasz, M. (1974). Education and the American Indian. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

TeHennepe, S. (1992). Issues of respect: reflections of First Nations students' experiences in post-secondary anthropology classrooms. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Thomas, G. (1981). Black students in higher education: Conditions and experiences in the 1970s. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Tierney, W. (1991). Native voices in academe: Strategies for empowerment. Change, 23 (2), 11-18.

Tierney, W. (1992). Official encouragement, institutional discouragement: Minorities in academe—the Native American Experience. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tierney, W. (1993a). Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tierney, W. (1993b). The college experience of Native Americans: a critical analysis. In L. Weis, & M. Fine (Eds.), Beyond silenced voices: Issues of class, race and gender in United State's schools (pp. 437). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W., & Wright, B. (1991). American Indians in higher education. Change, 23 (2), 37-44.

Tijerina, K., & Biemer, P. (1987/1988). The dance of Indian higher education: One step forward, two steps back. Educational Record, 68 (4), 85-93.

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tobin, J., & Davidson, D. (1990). The ethics of polyvocal ethnography: Empowering vs. textualizing children and teachers. Qualitative Studies in Education, 3, 271-283.

Troyer, E. (1992, October 28). Professors caution UAF on student diversity goal. Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, p. B-1.

U.S. Department of Education. (1989). Minority student issues: racial/ethnic data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics since 1969. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Education (1990a). Degrees conferred in institutions of higher education, by race/ethnicity and sex: 1976 through 1986-87. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Education. (1990b). Trends in racial/ethnic enrollment in higher education: Fall 1978 through Fall 1988. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). Indian nations at risk: An educational strategy for action (Final Report of the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. News & World Report. (1993). America's best colleges: A survey by the editors of U.S. News & World Report. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Senate. (1969) Indian education: a national tragedy—a national challenge. Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Report No. 91-501. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

University of Alaska Fairbanks. (1993). University of Alaska Fairbanks fact book, 1993 . Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks.

University of Alaska Fairbanks (1991). University of Alaska Fairbanks fact book, 1991. Fairbanks, Alaska: University of Alaska Fairbanks.

University of Alaska. (1970-71). University of Alaska catalog, 1970-71. Fairbanks, AK.

University of Alaska Fairbanks. (1993-94). University of Alaska Fairbanks undergraduate catalog, 1993-94. Fairbanks, AK

University of Alaska Statewide Office of Institutional Research. (1994). University of Alaska in review, 1994. Fairbanks, AK University of Alaska.

University of Alaska Statewide System of Higher Education. (1992). University of Alaska Statewide System of higher education statistical abstract, 1992. Fairbanks, Alaska: University of Alaska.

Valadian, M. (1993). University services for Aboriginal people. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Valli, L. (1986). Becoming clerical workers. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). Tales of the field: On writing ethnography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vos, V. (1993). Community-based traditional aboriginal teacher education. International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People. Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, Alaska.

Walker, R. (1993). Education and power. Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education and Indigenous People, Vancouver, British Columbia and Anchorage, AK.

Wax, M. (1971). Indian American: unity and diversity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weaver, H. (1988). A people in peril. (A Special Reprint). Anchorage Daily News, p. A1-H12.

Weis, L. (1985). Between two worlds: Black students in an urban community college. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (1993). Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States Schools. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wells, R. W. (1989). A survey of American Indian students. Office of University Communications, St. Lawrence University, Canton, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 778)

Wells-Lawson, M. (1992). Introduction: Symposium: minority participation in higher education. Harvard Educational Review, 62, 25.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, & The College Board. (1991). The road to college: Educational progress by race and ethnicity. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Education.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labor: how working class kids get working class jobs. New York: Columbia University Press.

Winick, C. (1970). Dictionary of anthropology. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams.

Wolcott, H. (1967). A Kwakiutl village and school. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Wolcott, H. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolcott, H. (1990). Making a study "more ethnographic." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 19 (1), 44-70.

Wolcott, H. (1992). Posturing in qualitative research. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in education (pp. 3-44). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (1990). Writing up qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). Transforming qualitative data: description, analysis, and interpretation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, B. (1990). American Indian studies programs: surviving the '80s, thriving in the '90s. Journal of American Indian Education, 1, 17-25.

Yarbrough, L. (1992). Three questions for the multiculturalism debate. Change, 24 (1), 64-69.

Yupiktak Bista. (1977). Education and the subsistence way of life: does one way of life have to die so another can live. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), Cross-Cultural issues in Alaskan education. Fairbanks, AK: Center for Northern Educational Research, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

APPENDIX A

ALASKA NATIVE PROGRAMS AND STUDENT SERVICES ON CAMPUS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Appendix A provides information on the various programs and services that address Alaska Native people and issues on the Fairbanks Campus of the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). The programs and services described here have been selected because they represent ways in which the Fairbanks Campus of the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) has recognized and responded to Alaska Native and rural students' interests and needs. This includes responses to the increasing number of Alaska Native and rural students on the Fairbanks campus, as well as responses to the general needs of Alaska Native people and rural communities. It is important to emphasize that the programs examined here are *only* those intended to serve Alaska Native students situated on the Fairbanks campus of UAF. A wide variety of programs and services for UAF students through the rural campuses have not been included.

Since the intent in gathering information on these programs was *descriptive* rather than *evaluative,* information has been drawn from official university publications when available (especially the UAF undergraduate catalogs and department or program brochures), as well as articles from the Fairbanks and UAF newspapers, and occasionally, from internal reports. When necessary, guidance was sought from the handful of people whose "institutional memories" provided clarification or information about the best route to pursue to compile the historical facts on these programs. Gathering even the most basic data was one of the more challenging and interesting aspects of this research project because of the lack of official records related to this subject.

Explanation of Information Included After Each Program or Description

Year Initiated

- *Year that the program began*

Administrative Unit

- *Where the unit is organizationally located within the University (the unit responsible for personnel, budget, and administration)*

People Eligible to Participate

- *Criteria for participation in the program or service*
- *"No Restrictions "indicates that all students are eligible to participate*
- *Not Applicable*

Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native/Native American

- *Reported only when there is accurate information and when this category is appropriate*
- *Not Applicable*

Original and Primary Source of Funding: UAF Funds, External Funds

- *External indicates that funding was initiated outside of UAF from sources such as a direct legislative appropriation or federal program funds*
- *UAF indicates that funding originated from an administrative unit within UAF*

Table of Contents of Appendix A

Alaska Native Education Student Association (ANESA) 275
Alaska Native Language Center (ANLC) 276
Alaska Native Leadership Seminars 276
Alaska Native Student Social Workers Association 277
American Indian Science & Engineering Society (AISES) 277
Center for Cross-Cultural Studies (CXCS) 278
Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Native Education 278
College of Rural Alaska (CRA) 279
College of Rural Alaska Community Advisory Council 280
Core Curriculum Option 281
Cross-Cultural Communications Program 281
Department of Alaska Native Languages 282
Department of Alaska Native Studies 283
Department of Rural Development 284
Festival of Native Arts 285
NANA House 286
Native Elder-In-Residence Program 287
Native Student Organization (NSO) 287
Orientation to Alaska Native Education Seminars 288
Recruitment of Alaska Native and Rural Students 288
Rural Alaska Honors Institute 288
Rural Teacher Placement Program for Teacher Education 290
Rural Student Services (RSS) 290
Student Support Services Program (SSSP) 292
Tuma Theater 293
Upward Bound 294
Writing Center Services at Rural Student Services 295

ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION STUDENT ASSOCIATION (ANESA)

The purpose of ANESA is:

A. To provide support for Alaska Native education students at UAF through monthly meetings; organization of study sessions for education classes; and dissemination of information about rural and Alaska Native education issues;

B. To provide information to teacher education students who are interested in teaching in Alaska's rural schools;

C. To network with Alaska Native educators throughout the state;

D. To collectively examine policies related to the education of Alaska Native students;

E. To participate in the recruitment of Alaska Native students for teacher education programs.
(ANESA By-Laws, 1992)

Year Initiated: 1988
Administrative Unit: School of Education
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 93%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (School of Education)

ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE CENTER (ANLC)

The Alaska Native Language Center documents and promotes the use of the Indian and Eskimo languages of Alaska.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

The Alaska Native Language Center was established in 1972 to document, study and cultivate the 20 native Indian, Aleut and Eskimo languages of Alaska. It houses an archival collection of about 8,000 items, virtually everything written in or about Alaska Native Languages, including copies of most of the earliest linguistic documentation. The Center has published over 200 books and booklets for scientific, classroom and general use, including grammars, dictionaries, folklore texts, and audio tapes.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Fact Book, 1993)

The Center was created in 1972 by the Alaska Legislature (the same year as passage of the Alaska Bilingual Education Act that required schools to provide a bilingual teacher when there were 15 or more Native language-speaking students). The Center was created in order to research and document Native languages, prepare school materials and distribute information to the public. It is "the foremost source of information about Alaska Native languages and Eskimo and Athabascan languages in the world . . . everything written in or about Alaska Native languages is gathered [in the Center], either in original or copied form."
(Fairbanks Daily News Miner, May 17, 1987)

Year Initiated: 1972
Administrative Unit: Department of Alaska Native Languages
People Eligible to Participate: Not Applicable
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Not Applicable
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External; UAF

ALASKA NATIVE LEADERSHIP SEMINARS

An essential function of the Alaska Native Studies Program is to inform UAF students of significant developments and perspectives current in the Native community. Each week of the fall semester a prominent Alaska Native leader is invited to address a regularly scheduled class on critical economic, political, and social issues relevant to the Native community. The public is also invited to attend these sessions.
(Mike Gaffney, Head, Department of Alaska Native Studies, 1993).

Year Initiated: 1983
Administrative Unit: Department of Alaska Native Studies
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Special 1983 Legislative Intent Funding)

ALASKA NATIVE STUDENT SOCIAL WORKERS ASSOCIATION

The Alaska Native Student Social Workers Association is a group of students interested in the field of social work. They meet to provide support to one another by sharing professional information; gathering and disseminating information on graduate study in related fields; and generating support for students to attend state and National conferences.
(Clara Johnson, Advisor to Alaska Native Student Social Workers Association, 1993).

Year Initiated: 1989
Administrative Unit: Social Work Program
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions on Membership
(Voting Restricted to Native Americans)
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 95%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Fund Raising)

AMERICAN INDIAN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING (AISES)

AISES is a private, non-profit organization which seeks to significantly increase the number of Native students preparing for careers in the Math, Science, and Health fields and in Math/Science teaching. The organization serves to nurture technologically informed leaders within the Native community by fostering mentor programs, leadership training, scholarship programs, conference participation, and summer job opportunities.
(Fund-raising letter from R. Scott Dickens, President, UAF Chapter of AISES, 9/25/92).

The UAF Chapter of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES) is part of a National organization that includes 90 chapters at colleges and universities around the country with over 1000 student and professional members. The scope includes students in science, engineering, math/science education, health and other related fields. Although there have been expressions of interest and spurts of effort over the years to create an AISES chapter here at UAF, the local chapter took formal shape in 1989. Meetings are held bi-weekly and activities include having guest speakers; participation in the UAF Fitness Fest; sponsoring trips for students to Anchorage to meet with medical personnel; participation in school science fair; sponsoring activities with health career professionals; and raising money to send several students to the National AISES Conference each year.
(Letter to Potential Mentors from R. Scott Dickens, President, 12/3/93)

Year Initiated: 1989
Administrative Unit: Rural Student Services
People Eligible to Participate: National AISES Criteria (Native American, Full-time Student)
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 98%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Fund Raising, Contributions)

CENTER FOR CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES

The Center undertakes research to develop the human resources of Alaska's multicultural society. . . . Research and development activities involving issues associated with rural Alaska are supported and administered through the School of Education's Center for Cross-Cultural Studies.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

The Center for Cross-Cultural Studies is the research and development unit of the School of Education. The Center addresses educational issues and problems inherent in Alaska's multicultural population. The Center administers instructional support contracts and grants for the school and issues publications and reports designed to improve cross-cultural understanding.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Fact Book, 1993)

Year Initiated: 1976
Administrative Unit: School of Education
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Not Applicable
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Ford Foundation, Legislature);
UAF (College of Rural Alaska)

CHANCELLOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NATIVE EDUCATION

"Following the controversy surrounding a statement made last fall about the grading of Native students at UAF, I appointed a committee of students, faculty and community representatives to advise me on Native educational issues and the role that UAF might take in addressing those issues."
(Chancellor's Statement, Office of the Chancellor, May 1992)

Year Initiated: 1992
Administrative Unit: Chancellor's Office
People Eligible to Participate: Alaska Native/American Indian Committee Members
Selected by Chancellor
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 100%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: Not Applicable

COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA

Original College of Rural Alaska

The College of Rural Alaska gives particular consideration to Alaska's rural residents and students in non-traditional settings. This college offers programs in the behavioral sciences, social work and education. Alaskan trained teachers and social workers are in demand in Alaska, and these programs are Nationally accredited. The college has branch campuses in Bethel, Dillingham, Kotzebue and Nome. The Interior Campus administers a number of education centers throughout the state, extending from Barrow to the Aleutians. The college is a center for the development and support of distance delivery and field-based degree and non-degree course work throughout the university. The five departments of behavioral sciences and human services, education, general studies, rural development, and vocational/technical education, all work to prepare students to be more sensitive to cross-cultural settings and diversity. Research and development activities involving issues associated with rural Alaska are supported and administered through the Center for Cross-Cultural Studies.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1992-93)

Reorganized College of Rural Alaska

To strengthen UAF's rural education and teacher preparation programs, the Board of Regents directed that organizational changes in the College of Rural Alaska be implemented by July 1, 1992. The behavioral sciences and human services department and the education department, including the rural program, will be transferred to the College of Liberal Arts. The rural campuses have been given expanded budgetary and personnel responsibilities. CRA will be headed by an executive dean reporting directly to the chancellor.
(The Cornerstone, Faculty and Staff Newsletter, 5/4/92)

The Board of Regent's action also called for reorganizing the College of Rural Alaska to strengthen rural education and teacher preparation programs. Effective July 1, 1992, the five rural campuses at Bethel, Dillingham, Kotzebue, Nome and the Interior will be joined by the School of Career and Continuing Education. The inclusion of SCCE will bring together in one unit UAF's major vocational-technical programs.

The CRA executive dean will be responsible for promoting and developing cooperative programs with other units throughout UAF, and also with the university system's campuses in Anchorage and Juneau to increase the effectiveness of delivery of education to rural Alaska.
(UAF News Release, 5/14/92)

The College of Rural Alaska is committed to education through which all Alaskans, particularly Alaska Native and rural residents, may make social and economic changes in their communities while protecting and enriching the quality of their lives and cultures. Particular consideration is given to the needs of permanent residents and students in non-traditional settings who seek skills and degrees suited to the rural economy and the well being of rural communities . . . CRA provides general education at the certificate and associate degree levels, as well as vocational/technical training and developmental courses. The college offers degrees in rural development and, in cooperation with the College of Liberal Arts, education and social work. The college geographically serves nearly two-thirds of the state, representing more than 160 primarily Native Alaska communities. Extended campuses include Northwest (Nome), Kuskokwim (Bethel), Bristol Bay (Dillingham) and Chukchi (Kotzebue). Also

included is the Interior Campus which is headquartered in Fairbanks. . . . The college is a center for the support and development of distance delivery of education and field-based degree and non-degree course work throughout the university.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

Year Initiated: Organized in 1988, Reorganized in 1992
Administrative Unit: UAF
People Eligible to Participate: Not Applicable
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Not Applicable
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF

COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

In recognition of the importance of citizen involvement in the planning, budgeting, and implementation of higher education programs and services for the State of Alaska, the Board of Regents (BOR) hereby establishes a College of Rural Alaska Council. The Council shall share governance authority with the Dean in the areas of major program change, annual and long-term planning. As well, the selection and retention of the Dean shall be a joint concurrence process between the Council and the Chancellor. In addition, the Council shall provide guidance and direction to the College while serving as a link of the University's constituencies to the Board of Regents.

The Board of Regents has authorized the establishment of a College Council to serve the College of Rural Alaska; Campus Councils for each of the campuses within the College of Rural Alaska; and allows for the establishment of Local Councils for sub-units/regions within each campus region. The College Council shall consist of seven members, one appointed by each Campus Council of the College: Aleutians, Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Fairbanks Interior, Kuskokwim, and Northwest.
(Rural CollegeTask Force Report, 2/4/88, p. 24)

The current composition of the College of Rural Alaska Community Advisory Council includes one additional Rural Center representative at-large, the Commissioner of Education and a representative from the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Fact Book, 1993)

Year Initiated: 1988
Administrative Unit: College of Rural Alaska
People Eligible to Participate: Members Selected by Regional Campus Councils
and by Appropriate Agencies
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (College of Rural Alaska)

CORE CURRICULUM OPTION

Undergraduate baccalaureate study at the University of Alaska Fairbanks is characterized by a common set of learning experiences known as the Core Curriculum [adopted in 1991]. The core provides students with a shared foundation of skills and knowledge which, when combined with other specific degree requirements, is designed to prepare students to better meet the demands of life in the 21st century. Eighteen credits in the Core Curriculum fall under the category "Perspectives on the Human Condition." Students are required to complete the required six courses in this category OR they can complete 12 credits from the required list plus two semester length courses in a single *Alaska Native language* [italics added] or other non-English language taken at the university level.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM

Cross-Cultural Communications is an innovative program designed to serve the needs of Alaska Native and rural students at UAF. Recognizing that the transition to university communication patterns presents challenges which vary in type as well as degree, depending on a student's cultural background, CCC offers several courses designed to capitalize on the similarities of experience brought to the University of Alaska by Alaska Native and rural students. It enables such students to make the transition more quickly than might otherwise be the case.

CCC courses that are not listed under Cross-Cultural Communications designators may be found under Developmental Studies, English and Mathematics, where they can be recognized by -CC# and -CCC section "numbers."

All full-time faculty associated with CCC have joint appointments in the Department of Anthropology.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

CCC is located within the College of Liberal Arts, and is designed to serve the academic needs of Alaska Native and rural students at UAF. Most students are advised into CCC classes by advisors in Rural Student Services. CCC serves students who are: advised into appropriate CCC courses through RSS advisors; making the transition from small rural high schools to the university. Courses offered by CCC emphasize the strengths, the similarities of experience brought to the university by Alaska Native students, and encourages them to observe and analyze their new environment in light of their own experiences.
(RSS Reachout Newsletter)

Cross-Cultural Communications previously published the magazine "Theata" which was written by students enrolled in Cross-Cultural Communications courses.

Year Initiated: 1975 (initiated in 1970 as "Student Orientation Services (SOS) English")
Administrative Unit: College of Liberal Arts
People Eligible to Participate: Students Who Meet Federal guidelines
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 94%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Federal Special Services Grant); UAF

DEPARTMENT OF ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES

There are 20 different Alaska Native languages: Aleut, Alutiiq (also called Aleut or Sugpiaq), Central Yup'ik Eskimo, St. Lawrence Island Eskimo, Inupiaq Eskimo, Tsimshian, Haida, Tlingit, Eyak, and 11 Athabaskan languages. These languages are becoming recognized as the priceless heritage they truly are. Since the passage of the Alaska Bilingual Education law in 1972 there has been a demand for teachers who can speak and teach these languages in the schools throughout the state where there are Native children. Professional opportunities for those skilled in these languages exist in teaching, research, and cultural, educational, and political development.

Central Yup'ik Eskimo is spoken by the largest number of people, and Inupiaq by the next largest. In these two languages major and minor curricula are now offered. Courses are also regularly offered in Kutchin, Athabaskan. For work in all other languages, individual or small-group instruction is offered under special topics. Thus there have frequently been instruction, seminars, and workshops also in Tlingit, Haida, St. Lawrence Island Eskimo, Aleut and Kutchin, comparative Eskimo and comparative Athabaskan.

UAF is unique in offering this curriculum, which benefits also from the research staff and library of the Alaska Native Language Center.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

Year Initiated: 1972
Administrative Unit: College of Liberal Arts
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Legislative Appropriation); UAF

DEPARTMENT OF ALASKA NATIVE STUDIES

The Alaska Native studies program seeks to provide the student with (1) a keen awareness of the scope, richness, and variety of Alaskan Native cultural heritages, and (2) a series of critical perspectives on the contemporary Native experience in the plural society of North America. The student's academic program will be interdisciplinary as it is built upon a combination of appropriate courses currently offered in other specialized disciplines and of an integrated set of core courses offered by the Alaska Native Studies Program.

The Alaska Native Studies Degree Program is designed to offer a second major or a minor for many bachelor's degree candidates. It seeks students from many fields of specialization who anticipate either direct or indirect professional involvement in Alaskan Native communities specifically and in multicultural settings generally.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

Alaska Native Studies is primarily an instructional program which provides coursework in political science, Native land rights, Indian law, economics, education, linguistics and Native humanities as they relate to the Alaska Native community. Native Studies faculty is a collection of faculty members with expertise in a variety of areas. Through their research, they apply their specialized expertise to Native affairs to develop knowledge, information and coursework relevant to the Alaska Native community. Alaska Native Studies sponsors the Festival of Native Arts and Tuma Theater, which are both student activities.

In addition to classroom instruction, the Department of Alaska Native Studies is also the official sponsor for five other programs (described separately in this report). They include Alaska Native Leadership Seminars, Festival of Native Arts, Native Elder-in-Residence Program, Rural Alaska Honors Institute, and Tuma Theatre.
(Alaska Native Programs booklet, 1982 with updated information in 1993 from Mike Gaffney, Head, Department of Alaska Native Studies)

Year Initiated: 1981 (First year degree program was available, but first coursework
in Alaska Native studies was offered in 1971)
Administrative Unit: College of Liberal Arts
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native:
Varies according to course and according to whether or not it is included as a requirement for other majors. Of the students who have graduated with ANS as a minor, approximately 28 percent are non-Native students.
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (College of Liberal Arts)

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Rural Development addresses rural/community issues and concerns through a variety of campus and field-delivered academic programs and services. A bachelor of arts in rural development, with a variety of emphasis areas, is the only degree option and it is available on the Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Fairbanks, Interior and Kuskokwim campuses. (University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

The purpose of the Department is to develop research and instructional programs that address the human resource needs associated with the various community and regional development efforts in rural Alaska, particularly those of the Native corporations and local governments.

In an effort to address some of the educational needs in rural communities, the department offers an interdisciplinary, community-oriented program leading to a bachelor of arts degree in rural development. The program will help rural Alaskans prepare for a variety of leadership roles in their own communities. Course offerings will provide students with a broad general background for the planning, development, and management of social and economic programs that are compatible with the current way of life and future development needs of people in rural Alaska.

The program is aimed at people currently holding or considering positions in any agency, Native corporation, municipal office, or other organization serving or situated in rural communities in Alaska. Five areas of specialization are available for students to choose from and to develop expertise specially suited to their personal, local and regional circumstances. The rural development degree program is currently offered on the Fairbanks campus and in rural regions having a full-time rural development university faculty member. (Department of Rural Development Brochure)

Year Initiated: 1983 (first course offered in 1983)
Administrative Unit: College of Rural Alaska
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native:
Varies according to course and according to whether or not it is included as a requirement for other majors. Of the students who have graduated with degrees in Rural Development 22 percent are non-Native students.
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (College of Human and Rural Development); External (Van Leer)

FESTIVAL OF NATIVE ARTS

The Festival of Native Arts began in 1973 when UAF students and faculty organized a spring festival to celebrate the artistic achievements of Alaska Natives. The success and enthusiasm of the first festival was evidence enough that an annual event should be held to celebrate the pride in cultural values and traditions. The purposes of the Festival of Native arts are:

1. to revitalize and promote knowledge and practices of Native arts and Native cultural heritage;

2. to provide opportunities to Native people of different cultural backgrounds for a better mutual understanding and respect;

3. to provide opportunities to non-Natives for better understanding of the cultures and traditional values of the Native people;

4. to encourage contemporary Native cultural development;

5. to provide Native students an opportunity to participate in a significant way in the revitalization of traditional Native arts and cultural heritage.
(Program for the 1992 Festival of Native Arts)

The Festival relies on volunteer work. . . . This program helps keep alive the understanding of our culture, heritage and traditions. Also, it give non-Natives in the Alaskan community the opportunity to see and understand the traditions and values of Alaskan Native people. (From letter asking for contributions from the Festival for Alaska Native Arts Committee, 1/24/92)

Year Initiated: 1973
Administrative Unit: Department of Alaska Native Studies
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 90%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (Department of Alaska Native Studies);
External (individual contributions, volunteer support)

NANA HOUSE

Early in 1984, John Schaeffer and Sarah Scanlan of NANA began working with Harris Shelton and UAF's Student Affairs staff on the idea of a small residence with a family atmosphere for new students from the NANA region enrolling at UAF. The idea was that with a familiar living situations, students could concentrate on the necessary adjustments to the teaching styles and academic challenges of the first year of college. UAF found a suitable location for NANA House, and a family which represented the values of the region was selected by the NANA Region Elders Council to run the program. Two successful college students were hired to live with the students as Resident Advisors.

A healthy, cooperative relationship has developed between the three primary sponsors of the NANA House project, the NANA Corporation, the Northwest Arctic Borough School District and the University of Alaska Fairbanks. . . . Although the Hall Directors and Resident Advisors of NANA House are not UAF employees and are not formally part of the Residence Life Staff, they have participated in training and in-service sessions with other staff members.

From its inception, the NANA House was intended as a family type setting within the urban college atmosphere, providing strategies and support for a successful first college experience while maintaining ties to the people and values of the students' home region. Over the years, the focus of the boundaries for NANA students has evolved to be more guidance toward developing balanced management of their academic responsibilities than a stress on restrictions of behavior, hours, and discipline issues. Currently NANA staff and residents spend more effort on topics such as time management and study skills rather than on behavioral code violations. (Report on NANA House prepared by RSS Counselor, Sue McHenry, 1990)

The Fairbanks Daily News Miner describes the NANA House as one of the most successful transition programs . . . it provides on-campus housing for 9 to 12 students in a small apartment complex supervised by a married couple. Students apply to the Kotzebue area NANA Corporation for placement in the dorm, which is primarily reserved for first-year students related to shareholders of the regional Native corporation. Returning students, and students from outside the NANA region, are accepted on a space available basis . . . . The NANA House program was initiated by the Native corporation, which underwrites special costs associated with its operation.
(Fairbanks Daily News Miner, 11/17/91)

Year Initiated: 1984
Administrative Unit: NANA Corporation and UAF Student Affairs
People Eligible to Participate: Alaska Native Students from NANA Region
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 100%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (NANA Corporation);
UAF (Student Affairs)

NATIVE ELDER-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAM

Alaska Native Studies has a Native Elder-in-Residence Program in which prominent tradition bearers from the Native community are invited to reside on the Fairbanks campus for extended periods during the academic year. Under the direction of Native Studies faculty, a class of upper level students meets regularly with each elder. These classes are designed to elicit the elder's cultural knowledge and experiences, with emphasis on the methods and conventions of the cultural heritage documentation process. (Mike Gaffney, Head of the Department of Alaska Native Studies, 1993).

Year Initiated: 1983
Administrative Unit: Department of Alaska Native Studies
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Special 1983 Legislative Intent Funding)

NATIVE STUDENT ORGANIZATION (NSO)

The purpose of the Native Student Organization is to promote success for Native students at UAF by seeking improvement of conditions, by seeking relevant and adequate academic services, and through the mutual help among members, to promote the understanding, retention and revitalization of Alaska Native cultures; to promote understanding and acceptance between members of different racial and cultural groups on campus; to promote better communications between students, faculty and administration, to promote Native student participation in policy-making for University programs and to prepare students for involvement in Native affairs. (Statement on Native Student Organization Membership Card)

Year Initiated: 1960s
Administrative Unit: Rural Student Services
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 95%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (Associated Students of the University of Alaska); External (Contributions)

ORIENTATION TO ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION SEMINARS

Alaska Native educators, and others with experience in the field of Alaska Native education, are invited to present weekly seminars to the "Orientation to Alaska Native Education" class, and these seminars are made available to others who wish to attend. The seminars and the course itself (ED 101) were developed to respond to: 1) the need and demand for more Native teachers in schools in Alaska; 2) the need to improve the retention rate of freshman and sophomore Native students at UAF; 3) the need to connect Alaska Native students at UAF with Alaska Native educators.

The goals of the program are to:
1. Develop a strong support system early in Alaska Native students' educational careers;
2. Provide opportunities for students to discuss issues related to Alaska Native education with people who are actively involved in Alaska Native education;
3. Read and react to written material that is directly related to current educational issues in Alaska;
4. Become part of a closely-knit student group that would move through the educational degree program as a team.

(Report prepared for the Dean of The College of Rural Alaska, C. Barnhardt, 4/19/89)

Year Initiated: 1988
Administrative Unit: School of Education
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 92%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (School of Education)

RECRUITMENT OF ALASKA NATIVE AND RURAL STUDENTS

Rural Student Services and the Office of Admissions and Records send personnel to high schools in some areas of rural Alaska.

Year Initiated: 1980
Administrative Unit: Rural Student Services, Office of Admissions & Records
People Eligible to Participate: Not Applicable
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Not Applicable
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (Rural Student Services and Office of Admissions and Records)

RURAL ALASKA HONORS INSTITUTE (RAHI)

RAHI is an intensive academic program designed to help prepare rural high school students for academic success in college. The program is aimed primarily at rural college-bound Alaska Native high school students between their junior and senior high school years. (Note: The program now also serves students who have completed their senior year).

Each student is selected by appliction to a special admissions committee based upon a minimum of a 3.0 grade point average and demonstraton of leadership through written recommendations from teachers, counselors and community members.

"RAHI is a dress rehearsal for college" according to program director Jim Kowalsky. "We bring the best students we can recruit to UAF to have them live, learn and work in the campus environment. We try to give them a realistic college-like experience and an opportunity to sharpen their academic skills before they actually take the plunge and enroll as full time college students."

The UAF RAHI program also includes follow-up support for students when they return home to finish high school, and during the time that they are on the campus pursuing academic degrees. Summer RAHI-sponsored UAF student internships with Native corporations are a part of the RAHI follow-up.

The RAHI program is sponsored by the UAF College of Liberal Arts and was started in 1983 by UAF chancellor Patrick O'Rourke and Native Programs Director Dennis Demmert at the urging of the leadership of the Alaska Federation of Natives. All financial support for international participants is furnished by non-UAF, non-state sources located within the sponsoring nations.

RAHI teaching staff include high school teachers and UAF professors. Dormitory tutoring and counseling staff include UAF students who are familiar with rural life and education. (UAF Press Release, 6/6/89)

The University of Alaska Fairbanks has two programs to provide rural high school graduates with a head start on college life: RAHI and Upward Bound. "Academic boot-camp," is the term Jim Kowalsky uses to describe RAHI's six-week crash course for promising high school juniors. Students must apply for RAHI, which then uses testing to identify academic weaknesses in 40-50 participants each summer. The program provides intensive instruction, while giving the rural students a glimpse at life on campus. The state programs costs roughly $4,000 per student. It was founded by UAF in 1982 at the request of the Alaska Federation of Natives and Bush legislators concerned about the high drop-out rate among Native students. During the first 6 years, 250 students participated in RAHI's "bridge program." (Fairbanks Daily News Miner, 11/17/91)

Year Initiated: 1983
Administrative Unit: Department of Alaska Native Studies
People Eligible to Participate: High School Students with Demonstrated Long-Term Commitment to Rural Alaska
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 99%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Direct Legislative Intent Appropriation)

RURAL PLACEMENT PROGRAM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The rural placement program provides opportunities for students enrolled in the teacher education program on campus in Fairbanks to gain practicum and student teaching experience in a rural school/community setting. In addition, X-CED students are afforded the opportunity to be placed and gain experience in an urban school setting. Faculty from both programs assist in the placement and supervision of the students.
(Center for Cross-Regional Education Programs Brochure)

Year Initiated: 1982
Administrative Unit: School of Education
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Between 10 and 20%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External; UAF (Department of Education)

RURAL STUDENT SERVICES (RSS)

Rural Student Services first began in 1969 as a culmination of the efforts by students and university personnel who appealed to the Alaska legislature to address the needs of Native students on the UAF campus. The result was the House Resolution No. 56 enacted by the legislature which provides the charge on which the current services are built. Since that time the program has undergone many changes and refinements while developing new pathways to serving the Native people of Alaska . . . the basic tenet of the RSS program direction is to offer a comprehensive approach to student development, which serves the student from preadmission through graduation.
(Report on the Status of Rural Student Services, RSS Staff, 1989)

Rural Student Services (RSS) originally began as a program called Student Orientation Services in 1969. Rural Student Services has become an integral part of UAF student services, particularly on behalf of Native college students. As increasing numbers of Native students graduate from village high schools, the pressure for UAF to meet it's mission of opening higher education opportunities for students from these rural schools has also increased. In addition to its hallmark advising and coordination functions, RSS provides a vital link between the rural communities and Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAAs) and the University. While RSS works in cooperation with other UAF departments and programs, it also strengthens the traditions of UAF's Native students by offering a forum for Native concerns, a gathering place for potlucks and by working closely with Alaska Native Studies Elders-in-Residence Program. RSS is more than just a department or offices; it is also a place for creating a cultural partnership in Alaska higher education.
(Rural Student Services Brochure)

* A review of several issues of "Reachout" the Rural Student Services newsletter, and a review of the "Program Review" section of a 1989 "Report on the Status of RSS" indicates that RSS is involved in the following programs, services and activities.

- Daily advising activities which include academic advising, financial aid advising, personal counseling and pre-admission services
- Peer tutoring program
- Informal and formal relationships with communities and school districts (NANA House is one example)
- Recruitment efforts that involve traveling to rural high schools and hosting visits from students in a large number of rural high schools
- Cooperation with ANS in hosting potlucks for the Elders-in Residence and providing support for Festival of Native Arts
- Support and guidance for the student organizations AISES and NSO
- Career counseling (on an individual basis and by bringing in guest speakers)
- Providing workshops for UAF staff and academic classes on inter-ethnic communication
- Provision of support and information for students interested in graduate study
- Serves as a clearinghouse for information and arranges for recruiters to come to UAF campus
- Personal support services (including a wide variety of individual and group services and supports which range from serving in an advocacy role in incidences of racism to developing support groups for Adult Children of Alcoholics)
- Alumni support programs including the development of an RSS Alumni-Scholarship Program
- Publication of a monthly newsletter "Reachout" which is distributed to Native students and to many UAF faculty and staff
- Orientation activities although RSS is no longer responsible for the EONS program which it developed in 198?
- Hosting of a wide variety of state, National and international guests who come to UAF who are interested in Native Programs (e.g. Alaska legislators, visitors from countries with indigenous people)
- Attempts to improve communication between academic departments and RSS
- Data collection on Alaska Native students who use RSS services
- Hosting activities each semester for new and returning students

Year Initiated: 1981 as RSS (began in 1969 as Student Orientation Services "SOS ")
Administrative Unit: Student Services
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 94%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External; UAF (Student Affairs)

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES PROGRAM (SSSP)

The Student Support Services Project is a federally funded grant program under the Cross-Cultural Communications Program whose goals is to retain and graduate students who meet eligibility guidelines. The project strives to met the special academic needs of students through a variety of services. Academic support is provided through credit and non-credit courses in math, English and study skills, as well as tutoring in general subject areas. Personal support is offered with an emphasis on a cross-cultural perspective. The project works closely with Alaska Native programs on campus, assisting students in achieving their goals and making the most of their opportunities at college.
(University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

The mission of the Student Support Services Program is to provide a wide range of academic and personal support to help students find the most appropriate way to achieve their goals and make the most of their opportunities at college. SSSP is a program to help students at UAF improve their skills and ensure a successful college experience. The Student Support Services Project is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and strives to improve both student retention and student success rate.

The project is unique and specially designed to meet the needs of Alaska Native students. The courses are developed and taught by instructors with extensive cross-cultural experience. Many of the tutors are former SSSP members. The project networks closely with other Alaska Native programs and related educational activities which promote success for Alaska Native students in college-level studies.

To qualify for services students must:

1) be a full-time undergraduate student and a citizen of the U.S;

2) belong to one of these groups
   a) first generation college status (i.e., neither parent has a 4 year baccalaureate degree)
   b) physically handicapped (verification is required)
   c) financially disadvantaged (income not exceeding 150% of poverty level, Pell Grant recipients are usually eligible).

The following services are available: courses; individual peer tutoring; group tutoring; diagnostic math and reading evaluation; advocacy and personal support; handicapped student services.
(Student Support Services Program Brochure)

Year Initiated: 1978 (approximately)
Administrative Unit: Cross-Cultural Communications Program
People Eligible to Participate: Determined by Federal Guidelines
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80 to 85%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (U.S. Department of Education)

TUMA THEATRE

Tuma Theater is an Alaska Native performing arts program jointly operated by Alaska Native Studies and the Theatre Department. Tuma (Yup'ik Eskimo for "a trail of path") was conceived by a group of enthusiastic UAF students in 1978, and is viewed as an important vehicle for dramatic expression of significant Native cultural traditions and experiences. Depending upon level of interest, students will have three educational options from which to choose as a participant: 1) pursue a major in theater with an emphasis on Native performing arts; 2) pursue a minor in Alaska Native studies with an emphasis on Tuma (15 credit minimum); and 3) independent study course work in Tuma and related fields (such as Native song and dance) tailored to the student's academic interests.
(Mike Gaffney, Head of Department of Alaska Native Studies, 1993).

Year Initiated: 1978 (inactive between 1980 and 1982)
Administrative Units: Department of Alaska Native Studies; Department of Theater
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 80%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (Chancellor's Office)

UPWARD BOUND

Upward Bound, a U.S. Department of Education funded program, is designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school. To help meet this goal Upward Bound sponsors academic year projects in selected rural high schools as well as the summer residential university campus life. Leadership and supervision for students is provided by Upward Bound academic instructors, residence hall counselors and administrative staff.

The summer Upward Bound academic classes are small, allowing instructors to focus on individual student needs. Teachers and tutors assist students as they work on mathematics and basic study skills. Students also receive academic advice on high school course selection. Upward Bound's life skills classes are designed to help students improve their decision making, communications, problem solving, and goal setting skills.
(Tanana Chiefs Newsletter "The Council," April 1992)

Upward Bound is a national federally funded program designed to improve participants' academic performance and increase motivation to pursue postsecondary educational programs. The program is aimed at promising high school youth who meet eligibility criteria including family income, educational level of the parents or legal guardian (first generation college student), and the participants' need for assistance in successfully completing high school. Upward Bound in Alaska serves primarily Alaska Native high school youth, the majority of whom are from rural Alaskan communities. Each summer, Upward Bound brings to the UAF campus 60 students to attend the program's six-week summer session. Another forty will participate in the Upward Bound math/science summer program which will bring students from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. In addition to academic courses and planned group cultural/recreational activities, the students participate in a series of leadership development seminars which address decision making, goal setting, values, conflict resolution, and alcohol and drugs.
(Student Service Division Education Equity Report, 1992)

Year Initiated: 1967
Administrative Unit: Student Services
People Eligible to Participate: Federal Guidelines
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: Over 90%
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: External (Federal Funding)

WRITING CENTER SERVICES AT RURAL STUDENT SERVICES

The Writing Center is staffed by English graduate students and upper class honors students. . . it is available to all enrolled students. The staff will review student writing projects during the successive draft process. They also can help you improve your grammar and usage. (University of Alaska Fairbanks Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94)

In 1991, the Writing Center began to provide several hours a week of services in the RSS student area on the 5th floor of the Gruening Building, in addition to those provided in the Writing Center itself.
(Communication with Rural Student Services Staff, 1993)

Year Initiated: 1991
Administrative Unit: Department of English
People Eligible to Participate: No Restrictions
Approximate Percentage of Participants Who are Alaska Native: 98% in RSS Area
Original and Primary Sources of Funding: UAF (Department of English)

Appendix B

ALASKA NATIVE RURAL AND UNDERGRADUATE COURSES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS, 1993-94

Appendix B is a list of the regularly-offered undergraduate academic courses that had "Alaska Native" and/or "rural" in the course title or description in the UAF Undergraduate Catalog, 1993-94. (Courses listed as being offered on an "As Demand Warrants" basis are not included). Seventy-eight courses met these criteria—six percent of the 1,273 regularly-offered undergraduate courses. The list below includes the titles of the courses and the academic unit in which they are offered. There are of course, other courses offered on the Fairbanks campus that likely incorporate information about Alaska Native and/or rural issues, but if such information is not included in the catalog, it is dependent on the interest of the individual instructor, and therefore I could not include them here.

Alaska Native and Rural Undergraduate Courses at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1993-94

Alaska Native and Rural Undergraduate Course Information Department: Name of Course - Number of Course	UAF Administrative Unit
ANL: Alaska Native Languages: Eskimo-Aleut - ANL 215	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANL: Alaska Native Languages: Indian Languages - ANL 216	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANL: Beginning Athabaskan Koyukon or Kutchin - ANL 141	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANL: Beginning Athabaskan Koyukon or Kutchin - ANL 142	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANL: Intermediate Athabaskan Koyukon or Kutchin - ANL 241	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANL: Intermediate Athabaskan Koyukon or Kutchin - ANL 242	ANL/Liberal Arts
ANS: Advanced Native Dance - ANS 360	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Alaska Native Dance - ANS 160	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Alaska Native Social Change - ANS 475	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Cultural Differences in Institutional Settings - ANS 220	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Cultural Knowledge of Native Elders - ANS 401	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Current Alaska Native Leadership Perspectives - ANS 250	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Native American Religion and Philosophy - ANS 375	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Practicum in Native Cultural Expression - ANS 251	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: Rhetorical Expression of AK Native Experience - ANS 300	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANS: The Alaska Native Lands Settlement Act - ANS 310	ANS/Liberal Arts
ANTH: Athabaskan Peoples of AK & Adjacent Canada - ANTH 383	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: Language & Culture: Applications to AK- ANS/ANTH 320	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: Native Cultures of Alaska - ANTH 242	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: Origins of Alaska's Native Peoples - ANTH 123	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: The Inupiaq and Yup'ik Peoples - ANTH 381	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: The People of Alaskan Southwest - ANTH 380	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ANTH: The People of Alaskan Southeast - ANTH 382	ANTH/Liberal Arts
ART: Advanced Native Art - ANS/ART 468	ART/Liberal Arts
ART: Beginning Native Art Studio - ANS/ART 268	ART/Liberal Arts
ART: Eskimo Art - ANS/ART 367	ART/Liberal Arts
ART: Intermediate Native Art Studio - ART 268	ART/Liberal Arts
ART: Northwest Coast Indian Art - ANS/ART 366	ART/Liberal Arts

CCC: University Communications - CCC 104	CCC/Liberal Arts
ED: Alaska Native Education - ANS/ED 420	ED/Liberal Arts
ED: Orientation to Alaska Native Education - ED 101	ED/Liberal Arts
ED: Orientation to Teaching in Rural Alaska - ED 456	ED/Liberal Arts
ED: Small High School Programs - ED 424	ED/Liberal Arts
ED: The Exceptional Learner - ED 375	ED/Liberal Arts
ENGL: Contemporary Native American Literature - ANS/ENGL 340	ENGL/Liberal Arts
ENGL: Narrative Art of Alaska Native People - ANS/ENGL 349	ENGL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Additional Topics in Advanced Yup'ik Eskimo - ESK 415	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Advanced Central Yup'ik Eskimo - ESK 301	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Advanced Inupiaq Eskimo - ESK 417	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Elementary Central Yup'ik Eskimo - ESK 101	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Elementary Central Yup'ik Eskimo - ESK 102	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Elementary Inupiaq Eskimo - ESK 111	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Elementary Inupiaq Eskimo - ESK 112	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Intermediate Central Yup'ik - ESK 201	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Intermediate Central Yup'ik - ESK 202	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Intermediate Inupiaq Eskimo - ESK 211	ANL/Liberal Arts
ESK: Intermediate Inupiaq Eskimo - ESK 212	ANL/Liberal Arts
HIST: 20th Century Circumpolar History - HIST 384	HIST/Liberal Arts
HIST: History of Alaska - HIST 341	HIST/Liberal Arts
HIST: History of Alaska Natives - HIST 110	HIST/Liberal Arts
JUST: Rural Justice in Alaska - JUST 340	PS/Liberal Arts
MUS: Native Alaskan Music - MUS 223	MUS/Liberal Arts
PS: Alaska Native Politics - PS 263	PS/Liberal Arts
PS: Comparative Aboriginal Rights & Policies - ANS/PS 450	PS/Liberal Arts
PS: Federal Indian Law and Alaska Natives - ANS/PS 425	PS/Liberal Arts
PS: Native Self Government - ANS/PS 325	PS/Liberal Arts
PSY: Community Psychology - PSY 445	PSY/Liberal Arts
PSY: Developmental Psych in Cross-Cultural Perspectives-PSY 240	PSY/Liberal Arts
RD: Community Development in the North - RD 200	PSY/Liberal Arts
RD: Community Development Strategies - RD 325	RD/CRA*
RD: Community Planning and Grant Writing Techniques - RD 351	RD/CRA*
RD: Community Research Techniques - RD 350	RD/CRA*
RD: Issues in Alaskan Maritime Development - RD 245	RD/CRA*
RD: Managing Community Development Programs - RD 450	RD/CRA*
RD: Perspectives on Subsistence in Alaska - RD 265	RD/CRA*
RD: Rural Development in a Global Perspective - RD 300	RD/CRA*
RD: Rural Development Internship - RD 400	RD/CRA*
RD: Rural Development Senior Project - RD 475	RD/CRA*
RD: Tribal People and Development - ANS/RD 315	RD/CRA*
SOC: Rural Sociology - SOC 301	SOC/Liberal Arts
SOC: Social Institutions - SOC 102	SOC/Liberal Arts
SWK: Child Abuse and Neglect - SWK 360	SWK/Liberal Arts
SWK: Rural Social Work - SWK 320	SWK/Liberal Arts
SWK: Social Work in the Human Services - SWK 103	SWK/Liberal Arts
THR: Introduction to Tuma Theatre - ANS/THR 161	THR/Liberal Arts
THR: Advanced Alaska Native Performance - ANS/THR 361	THR/Liberal Arts
** College of Rural Alaska*	

APPENDIX C

STUDENT DATA BASE FIELD NAMES

Information on each of the variables listed below was entered in a database (Panaorama II) for all students in the study.

Last Name
First Name
Birthdate
Gender
Ethnicity
First Language
Original Home Community
Current Home Community
Parents' Home Community
Alaska Native Regional Corporation
High School Graduated From
High School Graduation Date
High School Enrollment Year of Graduation
High School Enrollment Current
REAA District
Date Entered UAF
Age Entered UAF
Age Graduated from UAF
Age in September 1994
Other UAF Campuses Attended
Cross-Cultural Education Development Program (X-CED) Student
Other Institutions Attended
Age When First Attended College
Number of Transfer Credits
Entry Major
Second Major
Date of Change of Major
Major
Concentration or Minor
Degree Received
ACT Math Score
ACT English Score
ACT Natural Science Score
ACT Composite Score
Math Grades in Cross-Cultural Communication (CCC) Courses
Math Grades in Other Developmental Math Classes
Math 107 Grade
Math 131 Grade
Math 205 Grade
Math 206 Grade
Other Math Grades

Grades in all Cross-Cultural Communication (CCC) Courses besides Math
English Grades in Developmental Courses
English 111 Grade
English 211 or English 213 Grade
Speech Grade (required 100 level)
First Science Course Grade
Second Science Course Grade
Alaska Native Studies Courses (not required)
Alaska Native Language Courses
Total Number of Attempted Credit Hours
Total Number of Earned Credit Hours
Total Number of Quality Credit Hours
First Semester GPA
Second Semester GPA
Third Semester GPA
Fourth Semester GPA
One-Hundred Hours GPA
Final Cumulative GPA
Number of Semesters Without a Break
Number of Semesters Not Attending UAF (after beginning)
Number of Courses Taken Through Rural Campuses
Summer Sessions Attended
Work Experiences in Schools
Jobs On-Campus at UAF
Summer Jobs
Other Previous Employment
NANA House Resident
NANA House Staff
Rural Alaska Honors Institute Participant and Year
Rural Alaska Honors Institute Staff and Year
Rural Student Services Peer Advisor
Upward Bound Participant and Year
Upward Bound Staff and Year
Married or Single
Native/non-Native Spouse/Partner
Number of Children
Number of Pre-School Children
Number of Children Born While attending UAF
Housing
Primary Method of Transportation
Student Teaching Location
Employment first year after graduation
Employment currently

APPENDIX D

STUDENT INTERVIEW THEMES

Interviews with students were open-ended and relatively unstructured. The themes listed below were used as a guide and were modified according to the particular experiences of each student.

Previous School Experiences

- Elementary and high school experiences; special teachers and courses; timing of and reasons for decision to go on to college; reasons for coming to UAF specifically

Academic Experiences in College

- Selection of major; sequence of courses; support system for academic help; courses at UAF; experiences in public school classrooms in Fairbanks and in rural schools; working with advisors and individual faculty members; recommendations for new faculty; instances of gender, ethnic or cultural discrimination

Work Experiences

- Before, during, and (if applicable) after college; amount of time spent previously in schools and classrooms and in what capacities; relationship of work experience to coursework at UAF

Family and Community Influence

- Family and community contact and communication while in college; experiences of other family and community members who attended college; aspirations of parents for their children in college; dealing with family responsibilities while at UAF

Social Life During College

- Friends and roommates; residence hall life; student family housing; weekends; university holidays; socializing; student groups and activities; advantages/disadvantages of living on and off campus; travel experiences; participation in Native and non-Native events/activities/groups on campus; being a spouse and/or parent while attending UAF full-time; connections to community of Fairbanks; instances of gender, ethnic or cultural discrimination

Financial Concerns

- Support from what sources; current debts; inpact of finances on college experience and on job after graduation

Advice for Others

- Suggestions for incoming Native and non-Native students; things students would do differently if they were to start over again; recommendations for UAF administration and faculty; recommendations for local high schools; recommendations for parents and community groups

Reflections and Future Plans

- What kept you going; future teaching plans; graduate school; travel